

BILL057(22)
Testimony

MISC. COMM. 64

COUNCIL

COUNCIL Meeting

Meeting Date: Feb 22, 2023 @ 10:00 AM

Support: 91

Oppose: 201

I wish to comment: 10

Name: lynne matusow	Email: lynnehi@aol.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 16, 2023 @ 11:10 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>This bill is not clear about protections for those who live in condominiums. I live in a high rise condo in Honolulu, with at least 1,000 residents, plus visitors, contractors, workers, passing through daily. I am very concerned about people with firearms traversing the halls and riding the elevators, where we are trapped in transit with other riders. My reading of this bill does not make it clear that unless the property allows it, persons carrying guns are not allowed on property. That is important for our safety. There is a bill at the legislature that has language covering this and your bill needs to make it clear that the property has to allow it or no carrying of firearms.</p>		
Name: Ramya Swami	Email: rswami@bradyunited.org	Zip: 20001
Representing: Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 08:39 AM
Name: Marcus Tanaka	Email: changemyoil66@yahoo.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 08:45 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>It's obvious that those who support this bill do not listen to logical testimonies or understand what the 2nd amendment right is. With this being said, it will only take a lawsuit once this bill passes. Then those who voted to support this bill will get the bill for the attorney fees and any punitive damages. Which will be pushed on to John Q taxpayer.</p>		
Name: Shane I	Email: sagarage808@gmail.com	Zip: 96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 09:10 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose this bill</p>		
Name: Markos Cabaong	Email: mcabaong@gmail.com	Zip: 96819
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 09:49 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose this bill.</p> <p>Once again, it does not stop the problem of a bad person committing a crime. Criminals will not heed this or any law to carry out their bad intentions. It will only hamper and inconvenience the law-abiding citizens. This law is unenforceable. Enforce the laws that are already on the books, restrict those people that need to be restricted and stop the violation of the Second Amendment Rights.</p> <p>Sincerely and Respectfully, Markos Cabaong</p>		
Name: Cheryl Tanaka	Email: localaznchick05@aol.com	Zip: 96814

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 09:54 AM
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:

Thank you for making me more of a vulnerable victim to male attackers/rapist. Because that's all that this version will do, is make me not allowed to carry my firearm anywhere but the public sidewalk.

After 2 hearings, those who support this bill didn't listen to the facts about court cases, statistics, and even logic. I say logic because gun free zones don't make people safe. They only let criminals be safe because they know that no one is armed so they can do what ever they want until they hear the police sirens coming.

I can imagine a lawsuit will be filed later, which the city will lose.

Name: Tina Yamaki	Email: tyamaki@rmhawaii.org	Zip: 96816
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Retail Merchants of Hawaii	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 10:54 AM
---	----------------------	---------------------------------------

Name: Michael Rice	Email: michaelirice@outlook.com	Zip: 96792
-----------------------	------------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 10:54 AM
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:

My name is Michael Rice and I stand in Opposition to this Bill.

This bill as it stands is blatantly unconstitutional and will not survive a legal challenge. Similar bills have already been struck down on the mainland or have had injunctions against them showing that they will lose on merit.

Many of the prohibited places mentioned the City has no jurisdiction over, such as State and Federal property, as well as private property, and there are some vague definitions of the prohibited places.

The outright prohibition on public transport would also prevent many who rely on the bus and eventually the rail to get to work. For those who have the option of private transport, that will lower ridership for public transport, for those who have no option it denies them their rights.

I myself extensively use public transport on Oahu, driving causes me stress and anxiety. Not only that but I enjoy riding The Bus and hope to ride The Rail when it begins operations. I live all the way out in Makaha, on a few occasions I've missed the last Express bus of the day and have had to use the 40, which stops about a mile from my home, or the other option of waiting for an hour for a special bus to come along and drop me off closer to my home. I'm a large, rather intimidating guy myself and I've felt afraid walking home and waiting at certain bus stops. This isn't even accounting for incidents that take place on the bus itself.

The City, much less the State, does not have the resources to reasonably make all these proposed Sensitive Places secure. The very nature of Concealed Carry means you are doing it in secret and not advertising that you are doing so. Unless each and every private business is now going to buy metal detectors and hire security guards, the businesses will likely never know that someone is carrying a firearm, legally or illegally.

Parks are by their very nature widely open to the public. Unless you have guards actively patrolling and searching people who might potentially have firearms, this law will only stop those who fear the consequences of law. And given recent events and proposed changes to laws, those consequences become less and less of something to fear, and more and more of a joke.

We already have students walking around school campuses with firearms and other weapons with impunity, and I shouldn't have to remind you that it is already illegal for them to do so on many levels. And in most cases not only is nothing done about it but security are actively advised not to engage these shouldn't should they be found.

The City shouldn't even be taking this up at all with the exception of the 5 sensitive places spelled out in the Bruen Decision that are under their control.

Public Schools
 Polling Places
 Courthouses
 Prisons
 Jails

Name: Samuel Levitz	Email: sailorsaml@gmail.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:10 AM

Testimony:
 Despite clear evidence that Bill 57 will violate the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens still our local representatives are trying to push this through. Our entire ohana strongly opposes Bill 57.

Thank you.

Name: Brett Iwanuma	Email: b_iwanuma@yahoo.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:11 AM

Testimony:
 I strongly oppose this bill. It is direct violation to the scotus ruling in Bruen

Name: Royden Rebuldela	Email: royden.rebuldela@yahoo.com	Zip: 96720
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:14 AM

Testimony:
 You all need is to obey the "CONSTITUTION"and your oath to office. Any legislation that goes against the "CONSTITUTION" is "ILLEGAL".

Name: Michael Kekaha	Email: mkekaha@gmail.com	Zip: 96768
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:15 AM

Testimony:
 Good Morning,

I would like to oppose this bill as this bill will only affect law abiding citizens that have followed all established laws when obtaining their conceal carry weapons license. I understand if individual privately owned business do not wish to allow individuals with the ability to legally carry a firearm from entering their businesses as that is they're right. But banning the other places listed in this bill will seriously infringe on our rights to practice our constitutional right to carry a legally allowed firearm. It seems this bill is designed to mass punish law abiding citizens form exercising their rights. Police and Correctional Officers are not permitted to mass punish other people for other people's criminal offenses and neither should federal and state governments.

Name: Bradd Haitsuka	Email: bonefishless@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:17

		AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am opposed to this clearly unconstitutional bill. Bills similar to this have already been struck down in federal courts as unconstitutional. Soon the supreme court will be weighing in and will rule it unconstitutional as well, sighting the nyspra vs. Bruen decision. Honor your oath of office to support and defend the constitution of the United States and kill this unconstitutional bill, and stop infringing on law abiding citizens gun rights.</p>		
Name: Raymund Bragado	Email: ray729man@yahoo.com	Zip: 96797
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:18 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I'm a veteran with 2 combat deployment to Iraq 2003 and 2008. Please read and support the 2nd Amendment. I solemnly swear to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.</p>		
Name: Sherrie Galdeira	Email: Sherrieg@hilobusinesses.com	Zip: 96720
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:19 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose bill 57.</p> <p>As a realtor we often enter properties alone for viewings placing our safety at higher risk.</p> <p>This bill would not allow me to protect myself while working out in the field in sometimes extremely dangerous situations.</p>		
Name: Michael Elliott	Email: mike_elliotti@icloud.com	Zip: 96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:26 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>My name is Michael Elliott, I'm a retired Naval Officer with multiple combat tours and have been to over 70 countries, Small Business Owner, Husband, father, and grandfather. Life NRA member and Life HIFICO member</p> <p>As a lifelong gun owner and having CCW permits in multiple states, including two right now as Non-Resident CCW permits from Utah and Arizona, I have concealed carried for decades. After living in Hawaii for 20 plus years, I have been denied a CCW permit 5 times under the old rules, But the Bruen decision by the Supreme Court has changed that and I received one in January. Based on statistical data, there could be as many as 60,000 applicants in the near future for all islands.</p> <p>My issue with Bill 57 is that the majority of so-called Sensitive Places listed are and have been found to be UNCONSTITUTIONAL!! Your only option to pass any legal scrutiny is the "FIVE PLACES" per Heller McDonald and Bruen decisions. (Courthouses, Polling places, Schools (Public), Jails/Prisons, Legislative Buildings)</p> <p>Here is a summary of the latest federal court decision regarding "Sensitive Places" I suggest the legislature take heed of the current court rulings and standings on this issue to reformulate a bill to the "Five Locations"</p> <p>Case is Segal v Platkin New Jersey Bill A 4769 for reference.</p> <p>US District Judge Renee Bumb issues a TRO against this bill</p> <p>"After all, the Supreme Court was clear that in order for ANY gun control legislation to pass constitutional muster under the Second Amendment, such legislation must be consistent with historical tradition. The State has had six months since Bruen to identify well-established and representative historical analogues."</p> <p>Certainly, Defendants anticipated challenges to the legislation and should have been better prepared to defend the legislation constitutionality"</p> <p>"Private property owners have always been able to deny access to people, but to then say as a law abiding person have to ask permission or have the owner give permission every time, is not what the law historically has required"</p>		

"And what this does is it restrains the Second Amendment to a right only to carry on public property, which historically is not correct"

US District Court Judge Renee Bumb granted a TRO against the following NJ restrictions:

1. Parks, beaches and recreational facilities 2. Public libraries and museums 3. Bars, restaurants, other places where alcohol is served 4. Entertainment facilities

5. Casinos 6. Private property

7. Carrying of functional firearms in vehicles "At the same time, the Court implore the Presiding Officers to focus their argument on the legitimate legal issues pending before this Court after the clear dictate from the United States Supreme Court in NYSRPA v Bruen."

"But the Bruen Court expressly stated that the government may not simply posit that the regulation promotes an important interest" in the Second Amendment context.

Instead, "the government must demonstrate that the regulation is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation."

"While the legislature may disagree with Bruen, it may not disobey it."

US District Judge Renee Bumb It is not in the interest of Hawaii to enter into additional litigation upon which the overwhelming results are against the side stepping of Bruen by introducing "Sensitive Places" laws.

I am in **STRONG OPPOSITION** to this and all other bills that attempt to **INFRINGE** upon the 2nd Amendment rights of law abiding citizens.

I am available to further discuss options and remedies to this and other bills proposed this session.

Concealed carry sensitive places laws typically prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons in certain locations such as schools, government buildings, or places of worship. While the intention of these laws is to protect public safety, there are several arguments against them:

Violation of Second Amendment Rights: Concealed carry sensitive places laws can be seen as a violation of the Second Amendment right to bear arms. Gun owners may argue that they have a right to carry their weapons with them wherever they go, and that these laws unfairly restrict their ability to do so.

Ineffectiveness: Concealed carry sensitive places laws may be ineffective in preventing gun violence. Criminals who are intent on committing acts of violence may simply ignore these laws and bring weapons into sensitive places regardless. Meanwhile, law-abiding citizens who have obtained concealed carry permits may be disarmed and left vulnerable in these areas.

Potential for Discrimination: Concealed carry sensitive places laws may also have the potential to discriminate against certain groups. For example, if a law prohibits carrying weapons in places of worship, it may disproportionately impact members of certain religions who have a tradition of carrying weapons as part of their religious practice.

Inconsistency: Concealed carry sensitive places laws can be inconsistent and confusing. Different states and jurisdictions have varying laws and definitions of sensitive places, making it difficult for gun owners to know where they can and cannot carry their weapons.

Unnecessary: Finally, some argue that concealed carry sensitive places laws are simply unnecessary. Many states already have laws that prohibit the carrying of weapons in certain places, such as courthouses and airports. Adding additional restrictions may not significantly improve public safety, while creating additional burdens for law-abiding gun owners.

There are several compelling reasons to support the concealed carry of firearms that are worth considering.

Self-defense: The primary argument for concealed carry is that it allows individuals to protect themselves in dangerous situations. In today's world, crime rates are increasing, and individuals can become victims of violent crimes at any time. By carrying a firearm, individuals can increase their chances of defending themselves and their loved ones from harm.

Deterrence: The knowledge that potential victims may be carrying firearms can also act as a deterrent for would-be attackers. Criminals are less likely to target individuals who they believe may be armed, as they fear that their criminal activities could be thwarted by a well-prepared victim. This deterrent effect can help reduce crime rates and improve public safety.

Second Amendment: The right to bear arms is protected by the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. This right ensures that individuals have the ability to defend themselves, their families, and their property from harm. By restricting the right to carry

firearms, we would be infringing on this fundamental right.

Responsibility: Many people who choose to carry firearms take their responsibility seriously. They undergo extensive training and education to ensure that they are knowledgeable about firearms safety, and they follow all local and state laws regarding the use and carry of firearms. These responsible individuals can serve as models for others, promoting responsible gun ownership and safe firearm use.

Empowerment: The ability to carry a firearm can also provide individuals with a sense of empowerment. Knowing that they have the means to protect themselves and their loved ones can boost their confidence and help them feel more in control of their lives. This empowerment can have positive effects on mental health and wellbeing.

The Second Amendment of the United States Constitution is considered by many to be an important safeguard of individual freedom for several reasons:

Protection of individual rights: The Second Amendment guarantees the right of individuals to keep and bear arms, which is seen as a fundamental right for self-defense and the protection of individual liberties.

Balancing of power: The Second Amendment serves as a check against potential abuses of power by the government, as it allows citizens to defend themselves and their rights should the government attempt to infringe upon them.

Historical context: The Second Amendment was written at a time when the founding fathers were deeply concerned about the potential for government tyranny and the need to protect individual rights.

Preservation of cultural heritage: For many Americans, the right to own firearms is an important part of their cultural heritage and is seen as a symbol of freedom and independence.

Overall, the Second Amendment is considered by many to be an essential component of American freedom and a critical part of the framework of individual rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution.

If this bill passes it will be met with an immediate lawsuit seeking a TRO and Honolulu County will be responsible for all legal fees for the plaintiffs. Gun owners would also have cause for a class action suit with damages paid by Honolulu County.

It is best to defer this bill, let it die and let gun rights organizations sue the state if they try to pass SB1230 or HB984.

<https://www.uslawshield.com/key-second-amendment-supreme-court-cases/>

<https://www.harvard-jlpp.com/attention-originalists-the-second-amendment-was-adopted-in-1791-not-1868-mark-smith/>

<https://www.talksonlaw.com/briefs/text-history-tradition-test>

<https://fedsoc.org/commentary/publications/bruen-s-preliminary-preservation-of-the-second-amendment>

“To reason by analogy, it is as though [the government] banned all speech, but exempted from this restriction particular people (like current or former political figures), particular places (like private property), and particular situations (like the week before an election). Although these exceptions might preserve small pockets of freedom, they would do little to prevent destruction of the right to free speech as a whole. As the [Supreme] Court has said: “The Second Amendment is no different.” *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. at 635. It too is, in effect, destroyed when exercise of the right is limited to a few people, in a few places, at a few times.”

Name: jurrien boersma	Email: naluoner@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:31 AM

Testimony:
I strongly oppose this bill, as it violates our constitutional rights.

Name: David Reaume	Email: drwyandotte@gmail.com	Zip: 96819
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:36 AM
Testimony: I strongly oppose bill 57 you are trying to take away my right to protect myself and my family in public this is not right and it is against my constitutional right		
Name: JACK D DENIS	Email: kakaako9@yahoo.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:38 AM
Testimony: Do you think that whatever bill you politicians pass that the criminals or evil people really care? It just makes it harder for law abiding citizens to protect themselves or their families. Stop trying to make it harder for me to protect my family. To many crazies out there. By the way, build bigger prisons, tooo many crazies.		
Name: Casey Nakama	Email: casey_nakama@hotmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:38 AM
Testimony: I strongly oppose bill 57.		
Name: Michael Hruby	Email: hruby@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:40 AM
Testimony: I oppose any legislation that infringes or violates my constitutional right to bear arms.		
Name: Brian Ley	Email: brianLey0522@yahoo.com	Zip: 96778
Representing: Hawaii County GMAC	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:41 AM
Testimony: Aloha Brian Ley, vice chairman County GMAC. We strongly oppose this bill, besides being unconstitutional, concealed carry people commit less crimes than police officers do. In the vast majority of the time concealed carry people don't even fire a shot. Just brandishing a firearm is usually enough to stop a person. Also proven is crime rates go down in conceal carry states. And I personally know a mother that had to use a firearm to save her life. All these laws do is penalize law abiding citizens, the criminals are already carrying illegal firearms everywhere already. Mahalo for your time and consideration Brian Ley, vice chairman county GMAC		
Name: Richard Frey	Email: refrey2001@yahoo.com	Zip: 96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:44

		AM
Testimony: .		
Name: Dennis Djou	Email: dennisdjou@hotmail.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:46 AM
Testimony: I oppose this bill		
Name: Luisito Tadeo	Email: eiuol808@yahoo.com	Zip: 96797
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:46 AM
Testimony: I opposed this bill and i will fight my freedom and the 2nd amendments		
Name: Harry Pace	Email: surfgeorge@yahoo.com	Zip: 96771
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:47 AM
Testimony: This proposed bill is a preposterous, absurd, irrational, unscientific, illegal, immoral and unethical denial the inalienable, God-given/Natural Right to self-defense via bearing arms, as protected against government infringement by both the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and the identical wording in the Hawaii state constitution. Take your criminal traitorous attempt to harm Hawaii citizens and, well, you know...		
Name: Charleen Sprague	Email: attheuplands@gmail.com	Zip: 96740
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:49 AM
Testimony: I oppose passing Bill057(22) as it violates my constitutional rights as a law abiding citizen of the United States of America. Thank you. Charleen Sprague 76-4343 Kinau Street Kailua Kona, HI 96740		
Name: Mikhael Kobayashi	Email: mikhaelkkobayashi@gmail.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:52 AM
Testimony: Please honor your oath to support and defend the constitution of the United States of America. These limits are unconstitutional and fear based.		

Name: Jacob Bruhn	Email: rockpounda@yahoo.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:53 AM
Testimony: I strongly oppose Bill057(22) this is unconstitutional for law abiding citizens to exercise their constitutional right and restrictions on CCW.		
Name: James Logue	Email: jameslogue412@gmail.com	Zip: 96816
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:55 AM
Testimony: I oppose this bill because the City & County, nor the state, can adequately protect and defend citizens on their properties. Thus, the people should have the right (which they do via the US Constitution), to defend themselves if necessary. This bill will not prevent criminals or people wishing to do harm from bringing firearms into these restricted areas. It's nonsensical to think criminals will obey laws. Common sense and logical reasoning tells us this.		
Name: Norman L Akau Jr	Email: nor8ak@aol.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:55 AM
Testimony: Tommy Waters should be ashamed to bring up this ridiculous bill. The criminals will have a field day at our school , churches with no one to stop them.		
Name: Wayne Asam	Email: wayne@ndshawaii.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:03 PM
Testimony: Hi, I oppose this bill. It is a clear violation of the 2nd amendment. Stop wasting time and money trying to take away my God given right to protect myself and my family.		
Name: Leland Henobio	Email: leland_henobio@yahoo.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:03 PM
Testimony: Bill 57 will violate the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens.		
Name: Bill Murphy	Email: bmurphyi@bellsouth.net	Zip: 34957-5945
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:05 PM
Testimony:		

This bill. As written. Is overly broad under Bruen. If challenged it will cost taxpayers more \$. It is a "feel good" bill. But it is not specific enough. The point of the decision was. People don't feel safe in streets because prosecutors don't prosecute so police are restricted. Therefore. The people have a right to protect themselves from criminals. Who do have guns and knives. Licensed gun carriers are a benefit. Saying that all of Honolulu is "sensitive" historically will not hold muster under the 2nd Amendment. Violent crime in the area has increased. There is no evidence anywhere in the United States where concealed carry increases crime. To the contrary. It decreases crime. If you want a solid bill. List each place that is sensitive. And WHY. It is sensitive under Bruen. But saying "All" of an area and then setting a few exclusions, thereby blocking 90% of the area, is not going to hold up in a lawsuit. As a judge. I would hold that the bill is overly broad and not specific enough and not based on facts. Yes. I am a licensed practicing attorney. And. I wish we did not have to have guns. But we have a federal constitution and as a state we must follow the rule of law as interpreted by the US Supreme Court. Pushing the limit like this costs the people money. It is lazy and politically motivated. Write the bill correctly now so it can't be appealed.

Name: Philip Tong	Email: ptong8@sbcglobal.net	Zip: 96738
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:07 PM

Testimony:
I emphatically OPPOSE THIS BILL

Name: Eric Apaka	Email: 777tow@gmail.com	Zip: 96826
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:10 PM

Testimony:
This bill goes against the very thing that our founding fathers wanted to protect! You all forget that you are bound to the Constitution and that you are not to violate or supress it. By any of you wanting to pass this bill only says two thing. Number one, you are against the people and not for them. Number two, what you are doing if this is passed, is to create safe zones for criminals because they will be safe knowing that people cannot defend themselves in those areas.

Name: Duke Malczon	Email: dukehawaiian@yahoo.com	Zip: 96740
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:11 PM

Testimony:
This bill violates the second amendment.

Name: EORGE CARVALHO	Email: puhionui@gmail.com	Zip: 96743
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:11 PM

Testimony:
Please honor our constitutional rights whether to agree or disagree the Supreme Court rulings should be abided by all loyal citizens in the country.

Name: Lekeli Watanabe	Email: Inwatanabe@yahoo.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:15 PM

Testimony:

I strongly oppose this bill restricting the ability to CCW. The restriction to protect oneself against the threat of deadly harm against you or your loved ones is only protecting criminal behavior. All the restricted areas are where these crimes happen due to the fact that they know no one will be able to protect themselves. I also witnessed two people arguing at a park and one of them pulled a gun out from his backpack. I walk my dogs around this park daily.

Name: Nicholas Yee	Email: nnittayee@hotmail.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:16 PM

Testimony:
This bill is nothing but a cynical attempt to discourage law abiding citizens, who wish to protect themselves and their families from the criminal element now roaming our streets, from seeking a concealed carry permit. Bobby Cavaco, current SHOPO president, recently said "Violent crime is increasing, absolutely". He blames this on the decreased police presence and the increase in drug users and mentally ill out on our streets. I am my family's first responder when a danger is presented to me or my loved ones. What good will my weapon be if I can only carry in my home or on the street? I go to the mall, church, my workplace and bad things happen there also. "Gun free zones" don't work as was demonstrated at the dance hall in Monterrey Park and Michigan State. They tell students to "Run, Hide, Fight" in these types of situations. Well, wouldn't it be nice if they had something besides their cell phone to fight off the gunman? My cousin is an NYPD detective, eighteen years on the force, and he always tells me that police officers carry sidearms not to protect you, but themselves. Shouldn't I also have the same opportunity?
Thank you

Name: Kamakani De Dely	Email: kamakaniolu@hotmail.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:20 PM

Testimony:
This bill is against our constitutional rights. I oppose it.

Name: Susan De Dely	Email: susandedely@gmail.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:39 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill. It impedes our right to be safe as well as going against the constitution

Name: Mallory De Dely	Email: kmdedely@gmail.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:40 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill as it goes against our rights as American citizens and the Constitution.

Name: Davin Asato	Email: davin.asato@gmail.com	Zip: 96732
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:45 PM

Testimony:
To Whom It May Conern,
I am writing to encourage the opposition of HB57. In light of the HPD Chief beginning to issue concealed carry permits to

residents and allowing them to protect themselves, this bill is making that move counterproductive. By having such a broad definition of "sensitive places" this prohibits a proven law abiding citizen from being able to protect themselves in places where it could matter most. Rather than creating laws and hoping and praying that a criminal will follow it and putting law abiding citizens at further risk, our representatives should be looking out for the welfare of those that they serve and represent.
Please oppose HB57.

Thank you,
Davin Asato

Name: Jonathan Fong	Email: hippo004@yahoo.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:47 PM

Testimony:
Aloha, I oppose this bill. This is blatantly unconstitutional and goes against what the Supreme Court states. The 2nd amendment is a right and this is obviously an infringement on it. Criminals don't follow laws and this only hurts legal gun owners who want to and have the right to protect themselves and their loved ones. Mahalo.

Name: Jericho Cruz	Email: iloveeebabinka808@gmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:53 PM

Testimony:
I do not support this bill. It violates our 2nd amendment and bans law abiding citizens to defend themselves where almost crime happens.

Name: Kim Koa	Email: kimkoa@live.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 12:54 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill as it is unconstitutional and also creates criminals out of legal law abiding citizens.

Name: David Lau	Email: vicness151@yahoo.com	Zip: 96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:08 PM

Testimony:
I oppose Bill057. Nowhere in this bill does it have the needed text, history and tradition needed to make this bill constitutionally legal. The law makers who crafted and support this bill need to understand the Bruen ruling. This bill clearly goes against the Supreme Court's ruling that, any law to be made governing the second amendment, must have supporting text, history and tradition dating back from the birth of the bill of rights and the constitution. The State of New York attempted to pass a similar law and it already has been recognized as unconstitutional. The rule of law must prevail. The act of passing such a law is criminal, and a blatant disregard of the law. The constitution was written, not to control it's people, it was written and created to control the government. "We the People" oppose Bill057. Mahalo for your time and consideration.

Name: Galen Pao	Email: gpao563@gmail.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:09 PM

Testimony:

To the members of City Council

I, Galen J. Pao, want to go on record as opposing Bill 057(22) Relating to the public carrying of Firearms.

This Bill is overly restrictive. In its current form it basically only allows citizens to carry on public sidewalks and literally nowhere else. This is not the intent of the SCOTUS/BRUEN decision. Law abiding citizens should be able to carry their firearms in places where it is part of their everyday normal public life. You are denying law abiding citizens access to their normal public life by restricting them only because they now have a right to carry firearms. Your reasoning for public safety is not logical. Criminals do not follow rules and laws. But law abiding citizens do. This Bill will still put everyone in danger by criminals that not only defy laws but are knowledgeable of the restrictions you have put on ordinary law abiding citizens.

You have empowered the criminals and restricted law abiding citizens trying to protect themselves and their loved ones.

I ask that you review this Bill objectively, as anyone who has taken the oath of office to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States would do, regardless of their stance on the 2nd Amendment. A fair and just Bill 057 is needed, not a Bill that contradicts every aspect of the BRUEN decision.

Thank You.

Galen J. Pao

Name: Larry Duclayan	Email: fyafyta@duck.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:12 PM

Testimony:
I strongly oppose this unconstitutional proposed bill.

Name: Jon Abbott	Email: jonwebsterabbott@yahoo.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:16 PM

Name: MAX PETERSON	Email: maxpeterson87@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:20 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill, it is infringement on my rights from the constitution.

Name: Kyle Hara	Email: kylehara@gmail.com	Zip: 96797
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:23 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill.

Name: Joe Wilson	Email: qwavesjoe@yahoo.com	Zip: 96712
Representing: North Shore KoË»olau Diversity Collective	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:23

		PM
Name: Justin H	Email: erootaku123@yahoo.com	Zip: 96783
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:39 PM
Testimony: This is unconstitutional		
Name: Kualii Makaneole	Email: kmakeaneole@yahoo.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:43 PM
Testimony: I strongly oppose City Council Bill 57 as the intent is not to protect its law-abiding citizens but rather to disarm them and allow criminals to continue to commit crimes and not be prosecuted. I want my Constitution to be respected and the people's right to be heard. We are a Constitutional Republic, not a democracy. If you do not stand by the Constitution, you do not belong in your position. Why are the City and County so worried about the law-abiding citizens who own firearms and have been certified and vetted to conceal carry legally? The City and County can't stop illegal fireworks from entering the islands, which causes more harm to the people of Hawai'i than firearms within the state.		
Name: J Ching	Email: jco88@hotmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 01:46 PM
Testimony: This bill is too restrictive in that carrying anywhere except city sidewalks is illegal. It infringes upon our 2nd amendment rights to legally carry a firearm so that I may protect myself. Do not restrict my ability to protect myself or my family. It will only empower and encourage criminals.		
Name: Ryan Arakawa	Email: ryana@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 02:01 PM
Testimony: This bill contradicts the SCOTUS/BRUEN decision - but you clowns already know that. You are willing to waste tax dollars and tie-up the courts for an unconstitutional law.		
Name: ross mukai	Email: rossmukai@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 02:08 PM
Testimony: Our local government is wasting our tax money on these workaround schemes. In other states where they have tried these types of restrictive workarounds following the recent supreme court decision, they have only succeeded in making lawyers rich litigating them. All of these end-runs have been defeated in other courts and will face certain defeat in the 9th circuit. The least wasteful way forward is to figure out how we as a society want to live together, permit-holders and anti-gunners, rather than try to write creative end-run restrictions with an unconstitutional goal to make carry permits legal but not usable. Maybe we can save some money on lawyers		

Name: Yu Xian He	Email: yxhe01@gmail.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 02:21 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>This is another infringement on our right to carry. Again, with the recent rampant crime, nothing is being done about the repeat offender criminals but yet our constitutional right to carry is being limited. We can't defend ourselves as citizens and taxpayer dollars are going to continue to let criminals commit crime freely instead of letting us defend ourselves.</p>		
Name: Kama Dedely	Email: kdedely@gmail.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 02:36 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Bill 57</p> <p>Aloha,</p> <p>My name is Kamakani De Dely and I am against bill 57. I can't read your folks minds but what I've seen lately is a lot of bills that push back against any means of self preservation, ie carrying of a concealed weapon. "You can carry a weapon but not anywhere of importance." I can understand your quarrels in regards to the carrying of a holstered firearm in public but please give us the benefit of the doubt. We're not trying to be law enforcement but rather, be there until they can arrive and if that means stopping an immediate threat to life, then so be it. You want us to trust the process of what steps you place before us—all the while you, not taking the time to trust us carrying on like adults who have met and surpassed your requirements to carry a concealed weapon. There have been many situations of recent where someone with a firearm may have stopped a threat to life, for example, February 1 at Mililani walmart, a man described as being crazed drove over a woman pushing a stroller with an infant, and when a good Samaritan stepped in to help , was beaten badly with a crowbar, further more, unable to protect himself or the mother of an infant who was fighting for her life. Scenarios like this can take a life in a split second and can also be stopped in a split second as well. That's all that we ask for— is the ability to be that second that counts.</p>		
Name: Ryota Takuma	Email: XENISSANCE@GMAIL.COM	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 02:46 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose the proposed BILL057(22) as this outright affects all law abiding citizens who are qualified to Conceal Carry Firearms. This bill will have criminals to exploit places that criminals know they can commit various or violent crimes in places that civilians cannot protect themselves. We as law abiding citizens who are qualified to conceal carry a firearm is the first line of defense against an attacker to protect the innocent civilians, family and ourselves. It is imperative that this bill is opposed as the sensitive places outlined in the bill prevents law abiding citizens to protect and defend at anytime, anyplace, and anywhere. This bill introduced is very unconstitutional and we as citizens deserve the right to bear arms and use it in a responsible manner to maintain public safety.</p>		
Name: Shane Agena	Email: shane.agenas2@navy.mil	Zip: 96818
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 02:51 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Please oppose this bill.</p>		
Name:	Email:	Zip:

Bernardo Soriano	bern.soriano@gmail.com	96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 03:14 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose Bill 057. By banning law abiding citizens who have already undergone a highly scrutinized process to own and carry a firearm from most all public places, you take away their right to protect themselves and their loved ones from potentially violent crimes. This law would unfairly target law abiding citizens and make them become criminals; while criminals will continue to do what they do, which is not obey the law. Law abiding citizens who are vetted by the state to own and carry a firearm are not out looking to take a person/peoples life/lives. Their only priority is to potentially save his/her own life and their loved ones in case a violent crime occurs. It is a fact that police cannot be at all places at all times, HPD is understaffed as it is. We cannot nor should we fully rely on HPD to protect our lives or our loved ones lives. Most mass shootings that have happened have taken place at already known sensitive areas - schools. It is obvious that banning firearms from schools has not worked. Why continue to push for legislation that has shown to be ineffective?</p>		
Name: MARTIN V. COOPER COOPER	Email: marty.cdb@gmail.com	Zip: 96784
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 03:44 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>This bill follows neither the letter or the spirit of the law per SCOUS Justice Tomas' ruling in NY Vs. Bruen.</p>		
Name: Samuel Aquino Jr	Email: samuelaq@gmail.com	Zip: 96797
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 03:58 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Hello, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this bill due to its infringement on our second amendment rights to protect ourselves in public. It is also a violation of the SCOTUS ruling in the Bruen case.</p>		
Name: tony lee	Email: ling0821@hotmail.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 04:20 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Already unconstitutional in New York, as granted in the TRO in the 2nd Circuit.</p>		
Name: Christopher Deyoe	Email: kalikikopa326@gmail.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 04:22 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>After reading this bill I see an issue where if the areas where a someone who is legally carrying a firearm has to leave it somewhere so he can enter , we are increasing the chance that firearm can be stolen. If a person leaves it in their car, the car can be broken into, and now there will be another illegal firearm in the hands of someone who cares so little about law that they broke into, and stole another person's property. This will cause a higher risk of injury than someone who is responsible, and has shown proficiency with his firearm.</p> <p>Another issue I have is the provision where a landlord can make a provision in the lease about having firearms on the property of a lessee. I feel this conflicts with the "Place of sojourn" provided in the current law.</p>		

Although the belief seems to be that every firearm is only used for nefarious purposes, I feel that even those responsible owners are being put in a position where their firearms will be , at times, in a place where they may fall into the hands of criminals. I will say I do oppose, and other, legislation that forces a responsible firearms owner, with the proper permitting, to be forced to leave their firearm in a car, or place that may not provide adequate safety, or a criminal's ability to get to the firearm. Also any legislation that forces a person with the proper carry permit to have to decide whether he will be able to have the ability to defend himself against the criminals that will choose to ignore the law.

Name: Cass Nakasone	Email: onohunter@icloud.com	Zip: 96817-1067
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 04:39 PM

Testimony:
To Whom It May Concern,

I strongly oppose this bill that restricts law abiding citizens from carrying in all public locations. I think it is time we simply stop this nonsense. There is no law that will stop the mentally ill or person with criminal intent. You know it and anyone with common sense knows it. The current laws DO NOT stop criminal activity. Is this not clear to you? What makes you think declaring an area a "gun free" zone will stop someone who is intent on harming people from doing so? Why don't you just declare all areas a "crime free/violence free" zone... wouldn't this be just as effective? Furthermore, I would support this bill if our legislators make a law which allows them to be held criminally and civilly liable/responsible for persons who are hurt by criminals since our legislators seem intent on NOT allowing people to protect themselves in public areas. This implies they will be willing to take responsibility for our safety or otherwise guarantee our safety. These proposal are simply quite ridiculous and reflect extreme ignorance or malice.

Name: Alan Koons	Email: Koons.alan@gmail.com	Zip: 96740
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 04:59 PM

Testimony:
I oppose bill 057. It is a clear violation of constitutional rights and effectively limits carrying a firearm to sidewalks. This bill would cause more gun theft and causes to get in the hands of criminals. Law abiding gun owners would have to leave their firearm locked in their vehicles because it would be illegal to carry them into buildings and businesses with this bill. With car break-ins happening so much in Hawaii, criminals would take advantage of this. Guns are always safest on the person rather than tucked away in a care because they can't carry it into a building. Mind you, this does not take away from the major issue of being unconstitutional to put this bill in place.

Name: Laurie Burgess	Email: lburgess525@gmail.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 05:00 PM

Testimony:
I highly oppose this bill. Please take my testimony in consideration.

Name: iric Viscarra	Email: iricviscarra_73@yahoo.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 05:16 PM

Testimony:
Dearest Lawmaker's

I always believed that every person who have a good moral character, respect and value life have the right for self protection and

his family. And I'm hoping that you should respect every individual who wants to have a concealed carry license to exercise their rights to protect themselves and their families. we are not criminals, we are law-abiding citizens. Thank you!

Respectfully yours
Iric Viscarra

Name: Michael Scully	Email: mikskull007@gmail.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 05:31 PM

Testimony:
Aloha
A "sensitive place" is a place that is guarded by armed police 24/7. A park is not a "sensitive place". As we have sadly learned, if a criminal has deadly intent with a weapon in a park or a school, who is going to stop them if the police cannot get there in time. Concealed Permit license holders abide by the laws, have trained with firearms to achieve competency and safety standards and take our 2nd amendment rights seriously.
We have accepted the huge responsibility to protect ourselves, family, and other vulnerable citizens in deadly encounters. Every day across this great nation police officers, mothers, children, and vulnerable citizens are protected by concealed carry permit holders who are hailed as heroes by their local politicians.
Do not make Concealed carry permits prohibitive by overarching legislation that restricts and hampers law-abiding citizens to legally protect themselves and those in need.

See links honoring Concealed Carry Permit holders who saved lives: po

<https://www.nbcdfw.com/news/local/man-who-took-out-church-gunman-to-receive-states-highest-civilian-honor/2290236/>
<https://www.cnn.com/2017/03/17/us/beyond-the-call-of-duty-arizona/index.html>

Name: MARKOS CABAONG	Email: mcabaong@gmail.com	Zip: 96819-3652
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 06:58 PM

Testimony:
I strongly oppose this bill. Once again, it does not stop the problem of a bad person committing a crime. Criminals will not heed this or any law to carry out their bad intentions. It will only hamper and inconvenience the law-abiding citizens. This law is unenforceable. Enforce the laws that are already on the books, restrict those people that need to be restricted and stop the violation of the Second Amendment Rights.

Sincerely and Respectfully,
Markos Cabaong

Name: Kevin Cole	Email: kjcole52@yahoo.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 07:00 PM

Testimony:
Aloha,
I oppose Bill 57 in the strongest of terms. A person's Constitutional Rights cannot be impaired. One's First Amendment Right do not end when they leave their house, nor should their Second Amendment rights. Firearm owners in Hawaii are already the most vetted in the country. They are not a threat to anyone.

V/R		
KJ Cole Mililani		
Name: Eric Kaneshiro	Email: ehkaneshiro@gmail.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 07:27 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I ask that Honolulu city council members abide, if not support, the constitutional rights granted to U.S. citizens by the 2nd amendment and the SCOTUS.</p> <p>If the purpose of this ordinance to protect sensitive areas that have traditionally been subject to restrictions on carrying or possessing arms, please keep in mind that the carrying of firearms by private law-abiding citizens was all but non-existent in the entire State of Hawaii prior to the SCOTUS ruling. It is common sense that Hawaii State and County laws/ordinances should align and be consistent with the law of the United States of America.</p> <p>If the purpose of this ordinance to protect health, life, and property; and to preserve the order and security of the City, its inhabitants, and its visitors, please keep in mind that the CCW by law abiding citizens serves this purpose. It is criminals that threaten the health, life, property, order and security of the City, its inhabitants, and its visitors.</p> <p>It is my belief that CCW by law abiding citizens increases the risk to criminals of serious bodily harm, corrects the disparity of force between law abiding senior citizens and more youthful criminals, and hence, serves as a deterrent to crime. Further I believe that much crime is opportunistic, where a perpetrator will not offend where the risk to themselves is too great. For example, I don't know of an instance where a criminal walked into a police station and attempted to rob armed police officers. The risk is too great. On the other hand, defenseless victims are a great opportunity and easy picking for criminals. This seems like common sense to me.</p> <p>Private businesses should opt-out of concealed carry on their premises rather than opt-in. The default ruling by the SCOTUS is that citizens right to self-defense extends outside of the home. If private businesses choose to oppose the SCOTUS ruling then they should opt out of the law of the land as is their right.</p> <p>For these reasons, I again ask that Honolulu city council members abide, if not support, the constitutional rights granted to U.S. citizens by the 2nd amendment and the SCOTUS.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these points. Mahalo.</p>		
Name: Craig Kashiwai	Email: ck43@appliedtech.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 07:29 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose this as it infringes on my Constitutional rights.</p>		
Name: Frank Castagnetti	Email: flcastagnetti@yahoo.com	Zip: 96749
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 08:05 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am opposed to this bill. The Supreme Court has recently handed down decisions supporting citizens ability to exercise of our 2nd Amendment rights, and limiting government overreach, control or overt regulation. We must be able to train and carry in more areas, not less. You are essentially creating gun free zones. Research has clearly shown gun free zones are ineffective and</p>		

create places of vulnerability to the people. Do not pass this bill.

Name: Aaron Kobiella	Email: kobiella.aaron@gmail.com	Zip: 96771
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 08:35 PM

Testimony:

The equivalence of administrative crimes...

Violating unalienable rights to self-defense may be considered a breach of peace and one's oath to uphold the US and State Constitutions. This is a tyrannical approach to control the law-abiding, which is one of the main points of the 2nd Amendment of the US Constitution, reinforced by Section 17 of the Hawaii State Constitution... ultimately not supporting Our rights and liberties which is the actual job of public servants.

Should any law-abiding citizen be unable to defend themselves because they've been rendered vulnerable will legislators be held responsible for their harm or death? Gun-Free zones create the increased potential of defenseless victims disguised as "public safety", which ultimately is the result of neglect and improper public service.

If those that propose such Bills actually represented public safety then we'd see more to restrict and hold accountable actual criminals rather than attacking law-abiding citizens. These bills are a clear example of a cowards approach at legislation.

Name: Herbert Nishii	Email: LngBdr50@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 08:48 PM

Testimony:

I OPPOSE Bill 57

Please keep in mind the Supreme Court Decisions of Caetano v. Massachusetts, McDonald v. Chicago, District of Columbia v. Heller, and New York State Rifle & Pistol Association Inc. v. Bruen.

Many other States are trying to circumvent these decisions - example: New York, New Jersey, California, Oregon, Washington etc. These state are being found that their "Bill" passing are unconstitutional, yet they still try to circumvent these decisions. Therefore Honolulu will be following examples of unconstitutional actions! Why are we going to waste taxpayer money on trying to pass unconstitutional laws!

Beware of - Institutional Reform Litigation

The council members who support this Bill 57 should focus their efforts on criminals doing crime! NOT law abiding citizens asserting their right to the 2nd Amendment!

All of you raised your right hand and swore on a Bible to defend and protect the United States Constitution! Yet here you are picking and choosing what you would like to defend and protect! Shame on you!

You are wasting taxpayer time, taxpayer money, and taxpayer respect by rushing into passing Bill's that are unconstitutional - other States are doing the same thing - Honolulu should WAIT - and find out how these States outcomes turn out! Is Honolulu just "Fools Rushing In!" so Honolulu can say we are doing something? Even though this something is wrong?

Honolulu has to do the Right Thing - Defend and Protect the United States Constitution! Which ALL elected and appointed officials have sworn to do!

We also have to remember:

The POLICE HAVE NO DUTY TO PROTECT YOU

<https://mises.org/power-market/police-have-no-duty-protect-you-federal-court-affirms-yet-again>

"Common Sense" tells me to protect myself with a "Better Equalizer" than the bad guy! "POLICE HAVE NO DUTY TO PROTECT YOU" - The "Anti-Gun Persons" is always saying that we have protection against the bad guy - But according to this article dated

in 2018, that is not the case! <https://mises.org/power-market/police-have-no-duty-protect-you-federal-court-affirms-yet-again> - This confirms the 2A is needed to defend ones family, self, and property! The "Anti-Gun Persons" seems to want to make law abiding persons "victims"!

911 does not provide "instant action" when a crime is being committed - information is required, which involves "time" before help can be dispatched - by the time help arrives, the law abiding are victims and the perpetrators are long gone.

I dare you to dispute this! How many criminals are caught in the act before there are victims? The "Anti-Gun Persons" seems to want to make law abiding persons "victims"!

I OPPOSE Bill 57

Thank you,
Herbert Nishii

Name: Nathan Roldan	Email: nr24769@hotmail.com	Zip: 96786
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 08:52 PM

Testimony:

I oppose this bill. It is unconstitutional in its writing and is a defacto ban on our rights to carry a firearm for self-protection as guaranteed by the United States and hawaii constitutions. The US Supreme Court has struck down similar legislation. I urge you to strike down this bill ,as an affront to all law abiding citizens in Hawaii. This bill only seeks to punish the good citizens and does nothing to punish the criminals that break the laws daily. Please do not further hinder good citizens from protecting themselves.

Name: Joel Berg	Email: d2bergler@hotmail.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 08:55 PM

Testimony:

This bill is a shameful example of the council digging their heels in instead of honoring their oath of office. We can expect the city/county to be sued once again at the taxpayers expense and for what? So that our criminal class can be as free as possible to continue to victimize citizens without repercussion. Instead of reactionary prohibition we could have taken notes from the overwhelming majority of states that have successful firearms carry programs that do not violate the constitution. You're instead offering this mess that dismantles the American social contract without even the illusion of plausible deniability. When you refuse to deal with your citizens honestly you cultivate a adversarial relationship between them and the government, further shredding government credibility and institutions that rely on not just laws, but the good will of your citizens to maintain. I look forward to judicial system seeing this charade corrected and the rule of law restored.

Name: Samuel Webb	Email: sebb67@yahoo.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 09:14 PM

Testimony:

I oppose this bill because it is just a ban on CCW for law abiding citizens. Criminals will not follow this law or the many anit-2nd Amendment laws you pass.

Name: Stephen Yuen	Email: outdooryuen@yahoo.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 09:23 PM

Testimony:

I oppose this bill as it is unconstitutional as per the recent ruling from NYSRPA v Bruen.

Also this does nothing to deter a criminal intent on causing gun violence. All it does is leave law abiding citizen vulnerable to these criminals.

Name: Patrik Watanabe	Email: watanabep002@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96720
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 10:03 PM

Testimony:
Creating more safe zones is well intentioned yet invites disaster as seen in other venues with mass shootings. Criminals and maniacs do not abide by firearm laws. Only law abiding citizens follow the law. Why then would you disarm law abiding citizens? We should have stricter penalties for criminals caught with firearms. We should have stricter penalties for the illegal use of firearms. Please review past instances of lives being saved by good guys with a gun. Thank you for the opportunity to express my view.

Name: Jake Hanawahine	Email: da808rock@yahoo.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 10:15 PM

Testimony:
I Jake Hanawahine resident of Kailua,Oahu strongly oppose this

Name: Kevin Kacatin	Email: ukazzh@gmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 10:17 PM

Testimony:
I am in absolute opposition to Bill 57. Again, it continues to be irresponsible for the majority of the City Council to continue to support this politically-inspired ANTI-SELF DEFENSE measure. There WILL be legal action when this measure is passed as its clear which City Council Members have their "marching orders" from Blangiardi and the County of Honolulu will have to tuck their tail between their legs when the County of Honolulu will LOSE.

It is shameful that the majority of the City Council could care less about throwing away taxpayer funds in order to make a POLITICAL STATEMENT that will ultimately fail in the end.

Name: David Harwood-Tappe	Email: Dwharwood2008@gmail.com	Zip: 96778
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 10:47 PM

Testimony:
Trying to come from a place of love when touching on a topic such as this is not easy, and I mean no ill will, but in all seriousness, if you do not love our country, it's Declaration of Independence, It's Bill of Rights, and It's Constitution, then you should move to a different country! I hear that China has wonderful laws protecting freedom of speech and due process... I think you tyrants will fit right in!

SCOTUS has already ruled in NYSRPA vs. BRUEN that these kinds of restrictions on the 2nd Amendment, and attacks against law abiding citizens right to bear arms are blatant infringements. You must cease and desist immediately!

SCOTUS has made it quite clear that what you are currently trying to accomplish is completely unconstitutional! If you continue with this legislation you will just be wasting your time and taxpayer dollars!

I do not wish for my public servants to be wasting my tax dollars! If private businesses want to restrict firearms possession while on their premises that is strictly up to them. Otherwise WE WILL CARRY IN PUBLIC whether you like it or not.

Your extreme leftist (maybe even marxist) ideologies are un-American, and certainly not the Hawaiian way!
 The right to defend one's self by any means necessary, whether at home or in public, is a Hawaiian Right, an American Right and everyone's God-given right!
 Or maybe you do not believe in individual rights like those who founded our Constitution, or what I and millions of American believe in! Maybe that makes you a traitor to the Constitution and to We The People!
 Truth is light, and you are like roaches that scatter to hide in the darkness so you can rule over us without any accountability, doing so under the guise of "public safety" by creating laws that do not work. Criminals do not care about your laws and the only ones impacted by your laws are the law-abiding citizens.
 But that's just it, isn't it?! You want the law-abiding citizens to be subject unto you because you love your power and control so much you do not care how these laws negatively impact the freedoms of the people you are meant to serve! You just want your power and money.
 Remember, you are a public servant! You work for us and despite you brainwashing the majority to your propaganda, we the minority know the truth and we will not fall victim to your tyranny! We will not bow at your feet and beg for your safety! We are the only ones responsible for our safety. So do not infringe upon, nor usurp our right to keep and bear arms to protect and defend our right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness! If you are a tyrant in favor of this bill, I sincerely hope you think about where you stand and how history will judge you.
 Although history will judge you harshly, God will judge you certainly! I pray that you come to the realization that your ideology is flawed in so many ways and that you return to the light and change your ways!
 Mahalo for your time and hopefully a change of heart! May God bless and keep you always!

Name: Michael Harris	Email: mh8@hawaii.edu	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 17, 2023 @ 11:08 PM

Testimony:
 On the subject of Bill 57 (2022) CD1,

It seems apparent that the bill in question is designed to circumvent the recent rulings as to the law of the land in a roundabout and frankly dishonest and disingenuous fashion. There has been no great public cry for a stance which would ban firearms by default from private premises unless otherwise specified, and indeed, it seems nonsensical to pursue such a stance given that, for the majority of the nation, things work the other way around.

This bill seems nothing more than the pursuit a de-facto ban-through-other-means; to diminish 2nd Amendment rights to a functional nonexistence through a "death of a thousand cuts". As such, it seems to me to be an inherently unlawful and execrable path to pursue, and folly for our legislative bodies to entertain it.

Name: Julie Wilusz	Email: Julie96734@aol.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:07 AM

Testimony:
 By imposing these limits, you are violating the 2nd Amendment Rights of the citizens of this fine state. You have a long history of violating these rights from the law abiding citizens of this state, but have done little to nothing to disarm the non-law abiding citizens. All these restrictions will do is make the law abiding citizens targets for those non-law abiding citizens, as we have seen time and again, already. Criminals do not follow the laws, and roam our streets, stores, neighborhoods, etc., well armed, to wreak havoc as they see fit, and little to nothing is done. Yet you want to place more and more restrictions on law abiding citizens. This is the definition of insanity. A well armed populace becomes a much safer populace when the criminals know that they risk being shot back at when they pull a gun. Police can not be everywhere, and there are many instances on the mainland where an armed civilian has stopped a mass shooting before the police had the chance to even arrive at the location. Stop making us targets. If you insist on makin us targets, I would like to demand that any and all of those of you lawmakers who have carry permits give them up immediately, since we are supposed to be equal laws for all, not special laws for you. Remember, YOU work for US.

Name: Alan Miller	Email: mill8316@gmail.com	Zip: 96818
----------------------	------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:09 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose this bill. This bill is very blatant government overreach. This bill would limit the second amendment rights of law abiding citizens, to protect themselves in public. This bill is unconstitutional and even if it is passed, it will be reversed and ruled unconstitutional in higher courts when it is challenged.</p> <p>This bill is very similar to New Jersey and New York laws which are currently being challenged in US courts, and will likely lose when being evaluated using the criteria outlined in US Supreme Court Bruen decision.</p> <p>If this law is passed Hawaii and Honolulu County can look forward to being challenged and sued in court.</p>		
Name: Xavier Baker	Email: xavierbaker0@gmail.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:14 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to this bill for the simple fact that it's been proven time after time....when seconds count the police are only minutes away...these criminals don't care what laws are passed, they do not care about taking classes and getting permits, they do not care about sensitive places, they will do what they want when they want because they have no reason to be afraid. All we can do as law abiding citizens is be prepared and refuse to be that helpless victim who ends up on the news. Which is why I am against this bill, I refuse to be a victim of laws that only benefit criminals, and I will continue to stand by our 2nd amendment regardless of anyone's personal emotions.</p>		
Name: Reid Oya	Email: oyathebaldguy@gmail.com	Zip: 97682
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:18 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose bill 057</p> <p>It would ban carrying everywhere except city sidewalks. A lot of violent crimes happen in parking lots / structures ,shopping malls, airports, and many other places. One example is the 2019 Ala Moana mall shooting in the parking lot near Lucky Strike. Making places gun free zones is more dangerous. The criminals know the people in those zones don't have firearms and are less afraid because a lot of people won't fight back. These types of laws are being found unconstitutional in other states. Save our tax dollars by not having it go to court. See NYSRPA v Bruen concerning sensitive places.</p> <p>" A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."</p>		
Name: Marlee Kamakaala-Miller	Email: mkamakaala@gmail.com	Zip: 96818
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:27 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose this bill. The definition of sensitive places is far to broad, and infringes on my second amendment right to defend myself outside of my home. This bill goes against the US SCOTUS Bruen decision and is therefore unconstitutional.</p>		
Name: Sean Loo	Email: seanhl10@gmail.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:30

		AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose this bill because it infringes on our second amendment rights and inhibits law abiding citizens from defending themselves. Criminals do not follow the law and labeling somewhere as a sensitive place doesn't magically make it safe from criminals or prevent criminals from going to those places. This Bill would further embolden criminals because they will know that people in these so called sensitive places will be unarmed and unable to defend themselves. There should be more focus on locking up these criminals with multiple convictions, yet they get released back out on the streets to commit crime after crime on the working class people.</p>		
Name: Rudolph Lee Pangelinan	Email: rpangelinan@rlp-hi.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 06:45 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>This is an unconstitutional bill infringing on our 2nd amendment rights. Do you realize that law abiding citizens are the only ones that BILL057(22) affects? Criminals are laughing right now as they don't follow the RULE OF LAW. Please concentrate on mental illness for gun related issues and homelessness affecting our islands. Thanks!!</p>		
Name: Steve Robertson	Email: stphnrbrtsn@gmail.com	Zip: 96790
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 07:03 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>This bill will not hold up constitutionally. Please dont create a lot of pointless work for yourselves, having to prepare and support tules that cannot withstand legal scrutiny. Use your time and efforts to do something meaningful for the needs if your constituents.</p>		
Name: Robert Coster	Email: rcoster22@yahoo.com	Zip: 96749
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 07:22 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am writing to OPPOSE SB57 and admonish those who are supporting this bill which is in direct violation the Second Amendment to the Constitution. If passed, this bill will only be struck down after wasted time and money that can better be put toward issues that really affect the citizens of our State. State representatives that continue to attempt to push for laws designed to circumnavigate the legal carry of concealed weapons by qualified, trained, and socially responsible citizens are clearly not looking at nationwide statistics and clearly don't understand the issues of the current level of violence in society. This bill does nothing to protect citizens and in fact in my opinion reduces public safety at large by attempting to remove a very well documented barrier to criminals continuing to victimize the law abiding.</p>		
Name: Howard Murai	Email: howard.murai@gmail.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 08:13 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Ladies and Gentlemen:</p> <p>Bill 57 is clearly intended to circumvent a ruling by the US Supreme Court and is unconstitutional for that reason. Rather than spending the time and effort on a law that will be overturned by the first lawsuit filed against it, a more productive approach would be to specify additional training and reasonable demonstration of firearm safety and proficiency AND PROVIDE THE RESOURCES necessary for permit applicants to acquire or improve these skills. This would better assure both improved public</p>		

safety and preservation of citizen rights under the Second Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,
Howard Y. Murai

Name: Erik Brady	Email: maui-b@hotmail.com	Zip: 96778
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 08:21 AM

Testimony:

I love that Hawaii is issuing carry permits to lawful citizens ! I think Hawaii also makes it very difficult to acquire permits of any gun sort , carry being the hardest permit to obtain, still after the Supreme Court ruling . Everybody forgets that criminal do not care about the law and the paper it's written on . Bad people will carry illegal guns and weapons where ever they like . It doesn't matter if it's a gun free zone . The bus , the store , on the street , in the car , park or any building . So this law is the protect the criminals . Leave the innocent defenseless , in the face of bad , evil people law . Stop taking our freedom / rights . Bad people like easy targets . Thank you

Name: CLIFFORD CHEE	Email: cklchee@hotmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 08:29 AM

Testimony:

Please honor the oath you took to the constitution by either voting down this bill or amending it to delete all of the unconstitutional restrictions. Please remember that responsible firearms owners are the good guys and that this bill as written punishes only the good guys, not the criminals.

Thank you for your public service.

Name: Byon Nakasone	Email: info@robby-inc.com	Zip: 96790
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 08:57 AM

Testimony:

I oppose this bill

Name: Alan Urasaki	Email: alanurasaki@gmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 09:03 AM

Testimony:

I stand in opposition to this measure, and urge the council to defer this measure until state regulations are completed. Mahalo.

Name: Lauraline Holston	Email: lauraholston8743@gmail.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 09:19 AM

Testimony:

We see what is going on on the mainland, please don't allow Hawaii to become a dangerous place to raise our children & grandchildren.

Keep us all safe!		
Name: Robert Nehmad	Email: rnehmad@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 09:42 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am a resident of the City & County of Honolulu and support this bill.</p> <p>I hope that all members for the City Council support this bill as it is the wish of the majority of the population to maintain a safe and secure environment with a sense of ALOHA not through the use of weapons.</p>		
Name: Jamie Jackson	Email: jamie@jamiejacksondesign.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 10:30 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other sensitive places where guns cannot be carried. We need to keep people safe, as a citizen of this city I ask that you do your part on this issue and pass this bill. Mahalo, Jamie Jackson</p>		
Name: Carolyn Lee	Email: carolynjlee808@msn.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 10:57 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill as written without further amendment.</p>		
Name: Marisa Pangilinan	Email: marisapangilinan@gmail.com	Zip: 96816
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 10:58 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Aloha and thank you for your time. I am voting yes to pass this bill in hopes of keeping certain places safe for the people of Hawaii. Especially the most vulnerable which are the children. Please keep Hawaii safe.</p>		
Name: Nandita Sharma	Email: nanditaranisharma@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 11:24 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am very pleased that Bill 57 retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried.</p> <p>I strongly encourage the Council to support the current bill as written without further amendment.</p>		
Name: Laurie Pang	Email: kamlauri@gmail.com	Zip: 96789

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 11:44 AM
Testimony: This is a ridiculous bill against our rights as gun owners. I oppose this bill.		
Name: Philrobinson Sales	Email: airmanpbs@hotmail.com	Zip: 98028
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:06 PM
Testimony: Aloha! Concealed Permit license holders abide by the laws, train with firearms to achieve competency and safety standards, and take our 2nd amendment rights seriously. We have accepted the huge responsibility to protect ourselves, family, and other vulnerable citizens in deadly encounters, no matter what type of environment, in public, or private. Every day across this great nation police officers, mothers, children, and vulnerable citizens are protected by concealed carry permit holders who are hailed as heroes by their local politicians. Do not make Concealed carry permits prohibitive by overarching legislation that restricts and hampers law abiding citizens to legally protect themselves and those in need. Many Law Enforcement Agencies often call upon our citizens to become more involved in our community. We're answering that call today! Mahalo!		
Name: Carol Maxym	Email: dr.cmaxym@gmail.com	Zip: 96826
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 12:36 PM
Testimony: I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill. Carol Maxym		
Name: Linda Legrande	Email: lindalegrande2243@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 01:03 PM
Testimony: Aloha, I am pleased to see that the default provision has been retained. Please lets continue to lead the nation in sensible gun reform and laws to keep our citizenry safe. Mahalo, Linda Legrande		
Name: Laetitia Thibault-Santoro	Email: titiapetitecherie@hotmail.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 01:22 PM
Testimony: I don't want any guns near schools, parks, playgrounds, bars, restaurants. It is more dangerous than anything else! Protect our keiki!		
Name: Dawn Morais	Email: dmoraiswebster@gmail.com	Zip: 96825

Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 01:40 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>The daily reports of gun violence continue. They are horrific. We are not safe in all the places we frequent routinely.</p> <p>The current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to please support the current bill.</p> <p>The former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Warren Burger, was right when he reportedly said "The gun lobby's interpretation of the Second Amendment is one of the greatest pieces of fraud, I repeat the word fraud, on the American people by special interest groups that I have ever seen in my lifetime." An abstract of one of his articles on the Second Amendment says: "The need for a State militia was the predicate of the "right" guarantee, so as to protect the security of the State. Today, of course, the State militia serves a different purpose. A huge national defense establishment has assumed the role of the militia of 200 years ago. Americans have a right to defend their homes, and nothing should undermine this right; nor does anyone question that the Constitution protects the right of hunters to own and keep sporting guns for hunting anymore than anyone would challenge the right to own and keep fishing rods and other equipment for fishing. Neither does anyone question the right of citizens to keep and own an automobile. Yet there is no strong interest by the citizenry in questioning the power of the State to regulate the purchase or the transfer of such a vehicle and the right to license the vehicle and the driver with reasonable standards. It is even more desirable for the State to have reasonable regulations for the ownership and use of a firearm in an effort to stop mindless homicidal carnage."</p> <p>Let's not wait for mindless homicidal carnage to occur in Hawaii. Please pass this bill.</p>		
Name: Beppie Shapiro	Email: beppie@hawaii.edu	Zip: 96816
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 01:53 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Like many if not most Hawaii residents, I've been horrified and frightened by the proliferation of shootings. We have always felt protected by Hawaii's laws and regulation of guns, but now the Courts have stripped away a good deal of that protection. I grew up on Oahu, raised my children here, and have continued to enjoy that security from gun violence which our laws and regulations provided to me.</p> <p>Bill 057 offers the best chance to salvage what we can of our personal safety, and the safety of our children and the community. I assume C&C attorneys have been consulted for their advice on how much of Oahu you can protect under the guidance on sensitive areas. Every sensitive area you can protect, including schools, churches, parks, county buildings and offices, homeless shelters, publicly funded group homes, beaches, and private businesses whose owners refuse to allow guns on their premises, will add to my own sense of safety as I go about my life on Oahu.</p> <p>Please pass Bill 057 with the widest protections likely to survive court challenges.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony.</p>		
Name: mary babcock	Email: marybandito@yahoo.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 01:54 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.</p>		
Name: Jerry Ilo	Email: ILOJERRY@GMAIL.COM	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 02:07

		PM
<p>Testimony: Strongly oppose! Stop violating the Rights of Law abiding citizens! This is a de-facto ban on carrying a firearm in public.</p>		
Name: Nancy Taylor	Email: taylorn005@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 03:36 PM
<p>Testimony: Bill 57 provides badly needed delineation of specific places where firearms cannot be carried. Clear guidelines are essential in order for Hawaii's citizens to be able to continue to feel safe in our communities.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my strong support of Bill 57.</p> <p>Aloha.</p>		
Name: Esther Geil	Email: esthergeil@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 03:38 PM
<p>Testimony: I request your consideration of amendments to strengthen Bill 57:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted, so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties. 2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives. <p>Thank you for your support of this bill to make us all safer!</p>		
Name: Arthur Kluvo	Email: akluvo@gmail.com	Zip: 96797
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 04:39 PM
<p>Testimony: Once a person qualifies for an open carry gun permit, I'm stymied why you are being so restrictive about where it will be permitted. Personally I did not or will not apply for open carry.</p> <p>Other states permit open carry with restrictions and I'd thought Hawaii would perhaps copy similar limitations.</p> <p>Hawaii bill 57 is draconian as currently written and essentially cancels the reason someone might desire open carry.</p> <p>Please revise bill 57 to be more like similar bills adopted by other states. That would be a reasonable resolution.</p> <p>Wake up people!!!</p>		
Name: Glenn Arakawa	Email: thenwriters@gmail.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 06:09 PM

Testimony:

Dear elected leaders and representatives,

I wanted to let you know my thoughts about the recently introduced bill 057 that seeks to restrict law abiding citizens.

I never grew up in a home that had firearms or had an interest in owning or operating guns. It is a new thing for me. In 2020 I joined the other estimated 12+ million new gun owners in America because I believe in freedom and our Constitution (both US Constitution and our Hawaii State Constitution) and decided it was time to exercise my rights as a citizen of the United States and a citizen of Hawaii.

I did not realize how difficult it is to own a firearm in our state. I wanted to do it by the book so I paid for my wife and I to go through a firearms safety class. I subjected us (under the "old" system) to the long waits to get an appointment, filling out the paper work to acquire permits and appointments to register and have a background check and psych evaluation in order to be able to exercise that right. And I ask myself, what other RIGHT do I have as a citizen that I need to spend this kind of time and energy and to exercise? I also have paid a lot of money to buy safes, and built a cabinet that is secure to insure that my firearms are stored safely. It is already a hard and long process to obtain firearms, and now this bill will further restrict me, a law abiding citizen from just carrying a legally acquired firearm in all the places that it would make the most sense for protection makes absolutely no sense. Again, the legal gun owning community is not the enemy. We are going to be the most responsible, best trained, most informed group out there.

This bill is unconstitutional as it infringes upon our Second Amendment rights. During a time of national and local unrest private citizens have never been more vulnerable and the only way we have to truly live free and protect ourselves is to exercise this right to keep and bear arms.

Any bill that seeks to limit or restrict law abiding citizens will only cause harm and further endanger the public because it emboldens criminals to prey upon us. Pass legislation which empowers law enforcement or restrict criminal activity not the rights of law abiding citizens.

Restrictive gun laws, by the way, historically has no affect on violent crime. In the UK, where their citizens are not allowed to own guns, violent crime still happens with knives. Well, criminals there in the UK apparently only shoot or kill other criminals and try very hard to not hurt or kill "innocent" people.

Look at Chicago, I can stop there, a place that has some of the most restrictive gun laws has one of the nations highest murder rates. How about Paris France, they have terrorist attacks on their citizens in broad day light!! Please do a better job than these cities.

Passing this bill is standing up for the rights of criminals or those who have criminal intent that have not yet been caught or held accountable for their crimes. Please don't turn Hawaii into a Portland, Seattle, Chicago, New Orleans or Washington D.C. for that matter because you restrict law abiding citizens.

Have you not heard that New York's sensitive places legislation was just struck down as unconstitutional? Why would you try to pass similar legislation that is also unconstitutional?

Did you not take an oath of office which says that as a public servant you will "protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and the the Constitution of the the State of Hawaii?" Did you know that in our Hawaii State Constitution in Article 1 section 17 is exactly written like the 2nd Amendment of the US Constitution the "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed?"

And as already establish by NYSRP v Bruen, there are a very limited number of places that may be considered "sensitive" if at all but the burden is on the State or in this case the County to find a precedent according to Text, History and Tradition at the founding of the second Amendment which is 1791 or current era up until the ratification of the 14th Amendment. These types of places are polling places (where voting takes place for good reason), government buildings where laws are made, and court houses/jails (they have heightened security anyway from the DPS) and schools/colleges or universities (but only to restrict STUDENTS from carrying arms. Not to include faculty, staff and other workers). This is what is found in the Textual, Historical and Traditional supporting records.

What you guys are proposing goes far beyond that, to include, ALL government building or anywhere that is owned by the county, public parks, public transportation, anywhere there is a peaceful demonstration (this totally wrong and based on the wrong assumptions that those who are law abiding citizen who carry will use opportunities like this to cause trouble), malls or other retail outlets....I'm not gonna go on because its a ridiculous list.

Furthermore, making it a default for private businesses as restricted is obvious government over-reach. If a private business owner or landlord wants to restrict concealed carry, I suppose it is their right to do so, but the default should be yes to carry (protecting the 2nd Amendment right according to the US Constitution and Hawaii Constitutional Law Article 1 Sec 17) unless otherwise requested. But then comes the slippery slope of putting the rights of some people above the rights of others could potentially violate the 14th Amendment which is about equal protection under the law. This "interest balancing" test was also struck down by *NYSRPA v Bruen*. In the court of law, a person carrying a firearm on the property of a private business owner could at most be asked to leave but that would then be a case of trespassing (if they don't) cause there is nothing unlawful about lawful concealed carry. I think it would be crazy to state that lawful carry is not allowed on any private property cause all it would do is make them a target for criminals who don't care about rules or laws. It would be to their detriment if they post a sign. If I am a private business owner, I would probably carry for my own protection. Let's be real.

Honestly, declaring ANY place a "Gun Free Zone" would further endanger the public cause it would be like hanging a defacto neon sign on that place saying if you're a mass shooter or crazy person who wants to randomly kill a bunch of people come to this place a "Gun Free Zone" to commit the crime cause there will be no resistance. In that instance, let's consider, what would stop a person from committing a shooting or limiting the number of victims, the police who are about 7 min away (on average) after the 911 call or a law abiding citizen who is protecting their wives and children onsite who has a legally acquired license to carry and is right there to stop the threat. I love our men and women in blue but they can't be in all places at all times to stop criminals. Just today on the news reports say that it took them 15 min to show up when that guy in Waikiki barricaded himself. More often than not they show up after that fact when the body count is already high and the perpetrator is long gone. Let's add to the list of unsolved crimes at that point.

If you still choose to declare any such places, are you not aware that as an infringement according to *NYSRPA v Bruen* there are many lawsuits that have similar laws being enjoined or are on appeal and will likely get thrown out, my question is what will you do to make these places safe. Will you have armed guards and metal detectors at each of the entrances? It is important to consider the cost of such a law being passed because you are not putting the general public in danger of being victimized by a mass shooter who will choose these places based on what is on the 'gun free zone' list. No legislation no matter how strict it is will stop anyone from entering these places and if they want to.

A Georgetown researcher Dr. William English conducted a recent study which supported the fact that firearms are used about 1.7 million times annually to prevent crime or loss of life. Most incidents are prevented without a shot being fired. Check out this article and read the actual study conducted. <https://reason.com/2022/09/09/the-largest-ever-survey-of-american-gun-owners-finds-that-defensive-use-of-firearms-is-common/>. The evidence is compelling!

I plead with you as a father, a husband and a son don't "hand cuff" us as law abiding citizens of the means to protect our loved ones and ourselves in all public places. We can't choose where or when we will encounter a life threatening situation. The only thing we can do is be prepared to act should such an incident occur.

Believe me, I do not want to ever take a life but if it comes to keeping harm from my wife, elderly mother or my kids I would not hesitate. Don't criminalize the actions of a law abiding citizen who simply wants to stand in confidence that if I am ever put in a situation that would require decisive action against someone who would cause bodily harm, that I could take that action boldly and not fear being criminalized by my state government. Believe, me I know that as the saying goes, "there is a lawyer behind every bullet that leaves the barrel of a gun." It would be nice to no ever have to act in that way if at all possible.

If you vote to pass this bill you will open the county up to law suits because it is in clear violation of our fundamental rights as US citizens and Citizens of Hawaii to keep and bear arms. Our own State Constitution protects this specific right for us as citizens of Hawaii again according to the Text, History and Tradition. There is one question to ask, does it infringe on the 2nd Amendment or is it in anyway a 2nd Amendment issue? If so, the burden is on the county or state to present historical analogues from the founding era in 1791 up until the ratification of the 14th Amendment. If not such direct analogue exist, it should be thrown out cause you must satisfy the principle of constitutional avoidance not infringing on the rights of the people.

It is the one amendment that protects all the other rights namely the 1st Amendment. The only reason we live as free people,

really the ONLY free people in the world is because our government can't tyrannize us. That was the intent our founding fathers had when they penned the US Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I would hope that the government of the state of Hawaii would care about their citizens to also protect this God give right.

Stand for freedom and democracy, not for government over reach and tyranny. Don't hand cuff law abiding citizens. Work to fight crime and criminals and reduce violent crime in our state. Look at states that protect the rights of people to keep and bear arms, you will see that they have less crime per capita. I mean, if you have a bigger population and a more dense population you are gonna have more crime so be honest about how the numbers are interpreted.

Please do what is truly pono in this matter and strike this bill down.

I hope you will listen to the law abiding citizens who only want to do all they can to protect and defend themselves, their families and the most vulnerable in our communities.

Mahalo for hearing us out.

Glenn

Name: Janie Davis	Email: janiedavis@me.com	Zip: 96815
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 08:19 PM

Testimony:
I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Name: Rory Fujimoto	Email: chiefcornerstone1234@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 08:47 PM

Name: Lori Fujimoto	Email: roaringlow808@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 08:50 PM

Name: Austin Gapsis	Email: austingapsis@gmail.com	Zip: 96790
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 09:18 PM

Testimony:
I'd like to propose a bill that Tommy waters (the writer of the bill) is not allowed to speak or write going forward. If he doesn't feel the second amendment is worth protecting neither is his first amendment rights. Without the second there's no way to protect our other right.

Name: Eric Hammond	Email: erikdagoldfish@yahoo.com	Zip: 96762
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 09:49 PM

Testimony:

Aloha,

My name is Eric Hammond and I strongly oppose this bill. If this bill passes, it will form a de facto ban on concealed carry and severely restrict our Second Amendment right. The founding Fathers of our nation were very well aware of the importance of keeping the populace armed. They had just finished defeating the strongest army/navy of the time using a ragtag group of people who valued freedom at all costs.

SCOTUS ruled in the Bruen ruling that we, the citizens, have the right to carry and bear arms. And now our City/County is doing its best to sabotage that ruling by submitting this extremely restrictive bill.

This bill has already faced legality/constitutional problems in other city/states where it has been introduced. It is literally a copy of those bills. You will be wasting MY tax dollars with the lawsuits that will come when the City of Honolulu is sued.

If passed, this bill will create a confusing maze of allowable and non-allowable areas to conceal carry. I can carry in one area, but as soon as I enter another area, I have to magically make my gun disappear. I can't leave it in my vehicle, so therefore, I can't carry. A de facto ban.

If I need to get from point A to point B, I need to travel through point C to Z to avoid banned areas. A simple 10 min walk through downtown can now turn into 45 mins to an hour walk to avoid breaking the law. A de facto ban.

If I live in a rough neighborhood, but can only travel by bus, I can't carry to protect myself as I can't carry on The Bus. What do I do with my CCW gun? Make it magically disappear when I board The Bus? A de facto ban.

Law abiding citizens are being treated like we will all be potential criminals once we have a gun in our possession, and that is a straight falsehood.

We love this land and it's "rule by law". Stop treating us citizens like the criminals and start treating us like the responsible citizens we are.

Mahalo

Name: Gaye Chan	Email: gayechan@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 18, 2023 @ 10:40 PM
Testimony: I support bill 57.		

Name: Stephen Parris	Email: s2rb@comcast.net	Zip: 32404
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 01:10 AM
Testimony: All you have to do is follow the Constitution. Why are you breaking your oath by doing this? This is what Hitler and Stalin did. Do your duty and stop this.		

Name: Michael Trejo	Email: mtrejoechelon27@yahoo.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 02:35 AM
Testimony: Aloha I am offering my opposition testimony against bill 57 relating to the conceal carry of firearms. This bill is clearly a violation of our constitutional rights to keep and bear arms. There is no reason for this bill at all, I do not understand why on earth you people continue to push this. I personally have witnessed many instances of people being attacked or threatened by someone with a weapon whom by the way doesn't care about your laws. Victims have had no way to defend themselves but the criminals sure do, the way they see it they will only get a slap on the wrist. I have also heard of many people jokingly say they carry a gun concealed here in Oahu without a permit. They do not care about your laws, but you know who does the law abiding citizens like myself and others who take time and effort to train and be responsible citizens and apply for our concealed weapons permit. That's exactly who this bill 57 would harm the law abiding citizens who respect and follow the laws and just want to protect themselves and the people around them whom they love so dearly. Thank you all so much for your time and consideration of my testimony but I deeply oppose bill 57 Mahalo and Aloha.		

Name: Ellen Carson	Email: egcarson@icloud.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 07:37 AM
Name: Ellen Carson	Email: egcarson@icloud.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Church of the Crossroads	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 07:39 AM
Name: Ed Au	Email: edau@live.com	Zip: 96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 08:11 AM
<p>Testimony: Dear Sirs, Vote No, oppose this. Supreme Court gave us our rights. 2nd Amendment gave us this right. All you are doing is taking away our rights for protection by limiting what we can do. Criminals do not follow laws. Please vote NO. Thanks, Ed</p>		
Name: Ashley De Coligny	Email: ashley.decoligny@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:05 AM
<p>Testimony: Aloha, I am a Kaneohe resident and mother of two, kindly asking you to vote yes on Bill 057. Please, please keep your communities and keiki in mind over the interests of a few gun enthusiasts, and vote yes on these common sense regulations to keep everyone safer. It will save lives. Thank you for your time.</p>		
Name: April Ching	Email: hollyc@hawaii.edu	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:12 AM
<p>Testimony: As a citizen and mother of two watching the numerous mass shootings take place over the past few weeks has been extremely challenging. These shootings take place in public spaces where as many people as possible can be killed. I do not want this for Hawaii, my home. Weapons have no place in public spaces. Shooting has no place in public spaces. Our theaters, parks, churches, hospitals, libraries, sidewalks, stores, beaches, schools, and homes are not war zones or spaces we need to defend but are spaces for living together as a community. Our right to live must outweigh the right to bring weapons to public spaces. I ask you to take action to protect life. Protect our public spaces.</p>		
Name: Mary Babcock	Email: marybandito@yahoo.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:22 AM

<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important “default” provision as well as the list of other “sensitive places” where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.</p>		
<p>Name: Coralie Matayoshi</p>	<p>Email: coralie.matayoshi@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96816</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:25 AM</p>
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Thank you City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require “clear and conspicuous signage” to be posted if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties. 2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important Bill.</p>		
<p>Name: Ron Matayoshi</p>	<p>Email: ron.matayoshi@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96816</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:38 AM</p>
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require “clear and conspicuous signage” to be posted if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties. 2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives. 		
<p>Name: Robert Okuda</p>	<p>Email: robokuda002@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96701</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:49 AM</p>
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I will not support any measure that will violate my constitutional right or human right to protect myself and others around me. This bill excludes nearly all places to exercise my rights by including nearly all places.</p>		
<p>Name: Matthew Bush</p>	<p>Email: mattbushdr@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96791</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 10:29 AM</p>

<p>Testimony: I do not want concealed guns in Hawaii people are dangerous arming them with more firepower makes it worse. Please reconsider and put people before politics</p>		
<p>Name: Matt L</p>	<p>Email: mattscalling@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96822</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 10:39 AM</p>
<p>Testimony: Aloha Council Members,</p> <p>I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important “default” provision as well as the list of other “sensitive places” where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.</p> <p>Guns are inevitable but ask yourselves, do they really inhibit or just perpetuate violence.</p>		
<p>Name: Michael Nguyen</p>	<p>Email: m.nguyen.xiii@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96782</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 11:15 AM</p>
<p>Testimony: This bill makes no sense. Its like you giving a driver’s license and saying you can only drive on freeways, or letting you exercise freedom of speech but only if it won’t offend anyone or right to practice a religion but only if it’s Christianity. It makes no sense that we cannot protect ourselves and our families at the places where criminals attack the most. We aren’t even safe In Walmart parking lots anymore. Once again this only proves that our lawmakers protect and favor criminals and those who have no disregard for the law over the law abiding citizens who put their faith in a legal system that’s supposed to work for we the people over criminals who can run over teens in crosswalks and drive off then after turning themselves in get released knowing they have had over a 150 prior offenses. I oppose this bill</p>		
<p>Name: John Terry</p>	<p>Email: jack4002@me.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96744</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 11:52 AM</p>
<p>Testimony: I am opposed to Bill 57.</p> <p>Based upon the SCOTUS BRUEN decision, Bill 57 would violate the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens to bear arms in public for self-defense.</p> <p>The Constitutional right to bear arms in public for self-defense is not “a second-class right, subject to an entirely different body of rules than the other Bill of Rights guarantees.” (McDonald, 561 U. S., at 780 (plurality opinion). The exercise of other constitutional rights does not require individuals to demonstrate to government officers some special need. The Second Amendment right to carry arms in public for self-defense is no different.</p> <p>The supreme court reiterates that the standard for applying the Second Amendment is as follows: When the Second Amendment’s plain text covers an individual’s conduct, the Constitution presumptively protects that conduct. The government must then justify its regulation by demonstrating that it is consistent with the Nation’s historical tradition of firearm regulation.</p> <p>“Legislative assemblies, polling places, and courthouses,” which the Court tells us were among the “relatively few” places “where weapons were altogether prohibited” in the 18th and 19th centuries.</p> <p>It is true that people sometimes congregate in “sensitive places,” and it is likewise true that law enforcement professionals are</p>		

usually presumptively available in those locations. But expanding the category of "sensitive places" simply to all places of public congregation that are not isolated from law enforcement defines the category of "sensitive places" far too broadly.

The Second Amendment was adopted in 1791; "Constitutional rights are enshrined with the scope they were understood to have when the people adopted them." Heller, 554 U. S., at 634–635 (emphasis added)

Consistent with the SCOTUS BRUEN decision, the burden falls on the state of Hawaii to show that the State's proposed sensitive place requirement is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulations beyond those outlined above by the Court when the Second Amendment was adopted in 1791.

The passing of Bill 57 would be in direct defiance of the SCOTUS and will violate the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens to bear arms in public for self-defense.

Thank you,
John Terry

Name: Rita Kama-Kimura	Email: seeknfind@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 12:26 PM

Testimony:

Council members, once again, I oppose this bill aimed at limiting the constitutional rights of our citizens.

I find it bordering on insult as to how this bill treats our Hawaii resident that has gone through and passed all the required training! the licensing requirements! and the background checks! Sounds like you trust them just as much as you do criminals, except criminal don't obey or comply with any of your laws or requirements.

If there was emergency at a school in which you have a child, a grandchild and the police are called "and on their way" ... now you wait! What if there happened to be a trained licensed concealed carry individual there (sorry I forgot law abiding), tell me that wouldn't give you some relief, some hope?

If there are businesses or organizations who prefer not to have a CC Carrier in their establishment that is fine, just post a sign. Not sure how they would know unless an emergency situation arose and at that point, they'd probably be glad. However, that is their choice and it should be respected.

We are still a constitutional nation, a constitution that actually gives us our 2nd. Amendment rights, rights not limited to "sensitive areas." It give us the right to defend ourselves and our family, our loved ones regardless of where we are.

Your goal appears to limit the people's ability to defend themselves and others in the event of an emergency outside the home.

To compound matters there are those Bail Reforms bills making their way through the legislative branches, again! What a paring up these two would make!

We want to be more sensitive, more understanding, more flexible to those who intentionally break our laws and yet not give any thought as to the trauma the victims have and/are going through. Both financially and emotionally.

Then we hit them with ... and if you are out and about, we want to take away the right you have to arm & defend yourself in the event of an altercation.

Did you not listen to the testimonies some of the women gave "first time around?" Rape, beaten, harassments, stalking, restraining/protective order ... etc.

I ask you to do the right thing and stop this bill now!

Respectfully,
Rita Kama-Kimura

Name: calvert de coligny	Email: guerricde@me.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 02:14 PM
Testimony: Please keep guns out of these spaces. We have learned time and time again that more guns does not equal safety.		
Name: Lyle Hiromoto	Email: messy808@yahoo.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 02:40 PM
Testimony: To whom it may concern, I oppose this bill that severely limits the areas that a firearm may be carried. Crime can happen anywhere and at any time. This would include outside of police stations and Walmart parking lots. This bill will only endanger law abiding citizens. Criminals do not obey laws. Thank you, Lyle		
Name: Carol Yokoyama	Email: demayca@gmail.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 03:46 PM
Testimony: Aloha Council Members, Please strongly OPPOSE HB57. HB57 violates the constitutional rights of law abiding citizens. Please protect our constitutional rights and OPPOSE HB57. Mahalo Nui Loa for your time.		
Name: Evelyn Lance	Email: lance.evelyn@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 04:52 PM
Testimony: Thank you City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57: Both non-profit and commercial establishments that should be able to retain a right to allow firearms on their property. Please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted on property whose owners want to allow firearms to be carried on their property, so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is more important than ever to save lives.		

Name: Maria Song	Email: song.maria@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 07:09 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Thank you City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:</p> <p>1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties.</p> <p>2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives.</p>		
Name: Eric Akiyama	Email: eric1991j@gmail.com	Zip: 96919
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 07:46 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Aloha,</p> <p>I strongly oppose Bill057. The Honolulu Police Department is understaffed and crimes are increasing. This Bill if passed will severely limit law abiding citizens from being able to protect themselves. This Bill benefits the criminals.</p>		
Name: Mark Woodward	Email: markwoodwardmd@yahoo.com	Zip: 96818
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 08:36 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose City Council Bill 57.</p> <p>This bill is overly restrictive and limits the locations where a concealed firearm can be carried to essentially the Koko Head Shooting Cmplx.</p> <p>This circumvents the constitutional rights of the citizens of the City and County of Honolulu, under the Second Ammendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.</p> <p>The right of the people to keep and BEAR Arms, shall not be infringed.</p> <p>This bill continues to preserve safe areas for criminal /felons to carry out their activity without fear of interference by a law-abiding armed citizen.</p> <p>The requirements of this bill will also increase the chances of firearms being stolen from automobiles at shopping centers while the owners are shopping, unable to carry their firearm into the store.</p>		
Name: Brendon Heal	Email: heaviescc@gmail.com	Zip: 96707-4300
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 08:39 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>These restrictions have already been challenged around the country, and have already had enjoining rulings against them. I can</p>		

not see Hawaii fairing any better in court if the council decides to further infringe on the rights of every law abiding citizen of this city, county, and state.

The SCOTUS has already been clear in many rulings.

This is the right of "THE PEOPLE", not the city or state.

The right to keep and BEAR arms is a protected RIGHT

It is the burden of the city or state to PROVE the restrictions are backed by historical precedent (up to 1791) if it wishes to restrict such rights.

Please remember your oaths of office, to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

To do the opposite, with complete knowledge, is a violation of every citizen's civil rights.

Below is quote from a recent decision for similar ordinances.

Oppose this bill

Thank you

Brendon Heal

"Surely, Defendants had or should have had-the historical materials and analyses the State relied upon when it began its legislative response to Bruen.

After all, the Supreme Court was clear that in order for any gun control legislation to pass constitutional muster under the Second Amendment, such legislation must be consistent with historical tradition. The State has had six months since Bruen to identify well-established and representative historical analogues."

"the Presiding Officers must keep the litigation progressing on the right track. All agree that violent crimes involving firearms are tragic. But the dictate of Bruen is clear: "legislative interest balancing is understandable--and, elsewhere, appropriate - [but] it is not deference that the Constitution demands here." While the Legislature may disagree with Bruen, it may not disobey it."

Renee Bumb

United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey

Name: Eric Clark	Email: ejc148@hotmail.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 08:41 PM

Testimony:

This Bill is over reaching and essentially seeks to severely limit citizens' rights as recently established by the US Supreme Court (Braun NY case). One example, it includes adjacent parking lots to all definitions of restricted places. Therefore if one restaurant in one multi-facility or mall type layout serves alcohol, is the entire parking for the entire facility off limits? There are simply too many restricted places. This Bill will result in costly litigation, and the City and State will ultimately lose based on the Supreme Court decision. I will personally support litigation as it is such an over reach on Citizens' rights.

This is similar to certain proposals that are so out of step with the Supreme Court decision, that indeed HPD submitted written testimony against and showed up in uniform to testify. This current Bill 57 seems clear it is an attempt to exert the personal opinions of our City and State politicians, and in this case the Governor, over established Federal Law.

Enough is enough.

Thank you,

Eric

Name: Michael A Cobb jr	Email: mikecobbjr@hotmail.com	Zip: 96709
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 08:59 PM
Name: Barbara Shimei	Email: bshimei@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Indivisible Hawaii	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:06 PM
Name: Jefferson Foust	Email: jefferson_jay_foust@yahoo.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 09:52 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>As A retired navy veteran who has taken the oath to defend the constitution, I will always continue to uphold that oath. For those reasons, I oppose this bill as it will violate the 2nd amendment.</p>		
Name: Jesse Sapatu	Email: jesse.sapatu@gmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 19, 2023 @ 10:45 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose this bill it is highly unconstitutional. The areas where this bill elects to ban conceal carry is technically everywhere. It lists every public place there is to go as a private citizen which negates the right for a citizen to even carry. The only reason that lawmakers introduced this bill was to discourage citizens to not carry. Passing bills to bypass the constitution is not in the best interest of the people. If this bill gets passed, what is to stop lawmakers from making other bills to bypass citizens rights? Do they work for us? Do they represent us? Or do they only pass bills for special interests so they can get re-elected?</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>		
Name: Rachel Logan	Email: rachelalogan@gmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Moms Demand Action	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 12:08 AM
Name: Kimo Galon	Email: kimogalon@yahoo.com	Zip: 96826
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 12:08 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Aloha All,</p> <p>I strongly oppose Bill57. This bill is severely unconstitutional. This bill is a detailed version of what currently exists in Hawaii's firearm restrictions. As written the ordinance states that we are not permitted to carry anywhere in our county with the exception of our home, shooting ranges, and sidewalks. Heller vs DC, which ruled that we the people have the right to bear arms out side the home. There is no text or history that shows any kind of prohibition of carrying a firearm in "sensitive places" with the exception of federally prohibited areas.</p>		

The State and City shall recognize the Supreme Court cases that have laid the laws of the land. We encourage you the city council to follow suit with the Supreme Court decisions. It is appalling that you will directly take away our constitutional rights and continue to waste the taxpayers money and willing to risk a lawsuit that will cost the city and state money.

The right to self defense is our Constitutional Right. These ordinances will not protect anyone including innocent bystanders and continue to encourage violent crime in our cities.

I have seen way too much crimes around my neighborhood parks, malls and other public and private sectors. We are law abiding citizens but are treated less than the first criminals that continue to ravage our state. We see over and over again the criminals remain protected from any liability.

Name: Lisa Gibson	Email: lisahgibson@gmail.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:52 AM

Testimony:
I strongly support bill 57 and ask that the City Council support this bill.

Name: Esther Geil	Email: esthergeil@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 08:11 AM

Testimony:
Please pass this bill as it is now. I appreciate your taking this action to help our community stay safer.

Name: Constance Perry	Email: Conniealoha@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 08:39 AM

Testimony:
To my elected CM and law makers,
I urge you to pass bill 57 which would ensure the continued safety or our keiki, our health professionals and our diners to remain safe havens in our neighborhoods. I am personally, extremely upset with the supreme court's decision to allow concealed carry in Hawaii and disagree whole heartedly with that decision. But being that it passed it is now up to you to keep some areas off the limits. Please pass this bill and show your support for commonsense gun laws and responsible gun ownership.

Mahalo,
Constance Perry

Name: Ted Bohlen	Email: tbohl8@yahoo.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 08:42 AM

Testimony:
I support this bill and its reasonable restrictions.

Name: Jacqueline Lee	Email: jilee116@gmail.com	Zip: 96813
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 08:53 AM

Testimony:

Thank you City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:

1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties.

2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives.

Name: Gordon Fowler	Email: gordyf@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96701
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 09:30 AM

Name: Richard Holibaugh	Email: richard.holibaugh@gmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:09 AM

Testimony:

Good morning, and thank you for taking the time to review my testimony. I oppose Bill 57. If you still support this bill, then please feel free to Google the names of 2 victims who succumbed to violence in a public place. Places which the City Council will make it illegal for an individual who had been vetted by the Honolulu Police Department and is authorized to carry a concealed firearm.

Victim: Janel Tupuola, beaten to death on a public road.

Victim: Asa Yamashita, stabbed to death at an Oahu shopping center.

As an active federal law enforcement officer currently stationed in Honolulu, I feel that citizenry who have been vetted by the local police department, and are authorized to purchase a firearm, going through procedures outlined by the ATF, should be permitted to exercise a Constitutional Right.

Thank you for your time.

Name: Aimee McCullough	Email: mcculloughpsyd@gmail.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:18 AM

Testimony:

I'm pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Name: Richard Tillotson	Email: rtillotson@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:24 AM

Testimony:

Aloha,

Mahalo City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:

1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted at all public entrances if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties.
2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness and drug addiction in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives.

Mahalo for considering my testimony and mahalo for your service,

Richard Tillotson

Name: Alvin Dalisay	Email: vindalisay@gmail.com	Zip: 96738-5304
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:58 AM

Testimony:

Bill 57 proposed to discourage law-abiding citizens who are legally qualified to exercise their rights to conceal and carry a firearm by creating as many "gun-free zones" as possible. These proposed so-called "sensitive areas" does nothing more than create confusion and restrictions to every law-abiding citizens, which makes it absolutely impossible to exercise our legal rights to conceal and carry a firearm to be able to defend and protect ourselves and others against criminals if need be when faced with life threatening situations. While all these restrictions are meaningless and will be blatantly ignored by every criminal.

This proposed Bill prohibits carrying firearms in numerous public places, such as city-owned or controlled buildings, public parks, within 200ft of any voter service or ballot deposit location, in or on public transportation buildings, structures, or grounds, or within 100ft of any place where 25 or more people gather to exercise their rights. Further more, this bill prohibits carrying a legal firearm on the premises of private businesses, including parking lots, unless the private business "expressly" consents to it. This essentially narrows it down that the only place that a law abiding citizen can carry legally would be sidewalks. This creates such confusion and inherent danger to every law abiding, legally qualified citizen and infringes on their lawful right to conceal and carry a firearm because these restrictions are again meaningless to criminals.

The proposed Bill claims to preserve peace, order and security with mentioned restrictions, but fails to explain in their proposed plan on how they would take care of disarming violent criminals, who already ignore existing laws. The council does not have any active measures, such as metal detectors or guaranteed police presence, for any of these so called "gun free zone" areas to ensure that disarmed law abiding citizens are kept safe.

Respectfully,

Alvin Dalisay

Name: Hitomi Demura-Devore	Email: mdemuradevore@gmail.com	Zip: 96826
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 11:11 AM

Testimony:

I have been blessed to be able to raise my two children in Honolulu where I felt safe walking around in our neighborhood and sending my children to their school. However, things are changing in our city and neighborhood that we hear about people being shot and killed more often and I no longer feel safe like the way I did in the past. I think it is important that we have a bill to restrict

when and where a person can legally carry a firearm so that we may feel a little more safer being with people in those restricted areas.

I thank you City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:

1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted at all public entrances if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties.

2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness and drug addiction in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives.

Name: Lisa Metzger	Email: lametzger@mac.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 11:28 AM

Testimony:
I strongly support Bill 057. The first sentence of our Declaration of Independence promises us the right to LIFE, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I would argue that not being in constant fear of people with guns in public places, such as schools, parks, playgrounds, government buildings etc., is part of what constitutes my and my children's right to life. No one is safer with concealed weapons everywhere, it only allows for escalation of issues into murder. We are the #2 state in the country for least gun deaths as of now and that number will only dramatically increase the more places you allow people to carry guns. There is no aloha in concealed carry, only the promise of more senseless death. Please protect those of us and our children who do not want to be caught in the crossfire of those obsessed with their weapons of war and playing cowboy every day of their lives.

Name: Judith Armstrong	Email: judithannarmstrong@gmail.com	Zip: 96815-1506
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 12:02 PM

Testimony:
I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Name: Jay Henderson	Email: jayhenderson43@gmail.com	Zip: 96815-1458
Representing: Indivisibles of Hawaii	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 12:31 PM

Testimony:
I support bill 57

Name: Kanani Kai	Email: kanani.kai@yahoo.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 12:40 PM

Testimony:
Aloha.
I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places"

where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Sincerely and Mahalo.

Kanani Kai

Name: Marianne Whiting	Email: 747mkw@gmail.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 12:46 PM

Testimony:

I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill. Thank you!

Name: steve kumasaka	Email: macsak@gmail.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 01:00 PM

Testimony:

i STRONGLY OPPOSE this UNCONTITUTIONAL OVER-REACH by the city
please follow the Bruen decision from the SUPREME COURT of the US that outlines permitted sensitive places

i supported the CD1 proposed by councilmembers tupola and tulba because it followed the Bruen decision

please avoid long and costly litigation that the C&C will LOSE, just like other jurisdictions that have tried similar restrictions

mahalo

steve

Name: Renny Chee	Email: rennchee@gmail.com	Zip: 96797
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 01:11 PM

Testimony:

This bill would be unconstitutional and would do nothing to deter crime but target lawful citizens wishing to protect themselves.

Name: Beth Anderson	Email: Kailua5@aol.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 01:13 PM

Testimony:

It is gratifying to see Bill 57 continues to pass readings and Honolulu City Council Members are committed to protecting the safety and lives of Oahu residents and citizens. I am very pleased the bill retains the very important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill in its entirety.

Statistics bear out that weak gun restrictions lead to more gun violence. We know that states in our nation with the weakest gun laws have the highest percentage of gun violence. It is illogical to loosen gun restrictions in Hawaii and forfeit the safety that gun restriction laws provide. Bill 57 will help maintain protections we had prior to the egregious, thoughtless Supreme Court decision regarding carry laws.

America is experiencing an epidemic of mass shootings, many committed by people who legally purchased guns. In many states, Lawmakers have caved to the gun lobby and gotten rid of many gun law restrictions. In many cases, these legislators

receive large campaign donations from the gun lobby and they go along with their false, illogical, deadly arguments which claim that more guns, and fewer gun restrictions make our communities safer. These arguments are false and need to be rejected.

Thank you for supporting Bill 57 and strengthening gun law protections.

Name: Chris Wikoff	Email: chriswikoff2@earthlink.net	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 01:23 PM

Testimony:

I strongly oppose Honolulu Bill 57. Bill 57 is clearly designed to violate the Constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens and in opposition to the recent U.S. Supreme court ruling on concealed carry. Concealed carry of fire arms was determined to be a Constitutionally guaranteed right of all citizens of all States in the Union of United States of America which includes America's 50th State of Hawai'i. Allowing concealed carry only on public sidewalks and streets while excluding all other venues and locations is contrary to the intention of concealed carry being to provide protection for the bearer of the fire arm. This effectively imposes an infringement of every citizens right to bear arms to protect themselves. It eliminates the ability of armed citizens to protect innocent children and unarmed adults when their lives are threatened by armed criminals.

Bill 57 is simply a repulsive reaction to all firearms in the hands of the law abiding public. It demonstrates a lack of understanding of legal firearms and the Constitutional undeniable Right of every citizen in the U.S.A. to keep and bear arms. The only ones benefiting from this unconstitutional law are the criminals that will continue to own and carry firearms regardless of any restrictions imposed by a radical and rebellious City government. Law abiding citizens will be left defenseless at the hands of criminals who are going to commit armed crimes regardless of laws. Bill 57 would criminalize concealed carry causing law abiding citizens with a concealed carry permit to be punished as a criminal if they carry the firearm into any reasonable location where it may be required for self-defense or the defense of an unarmed person or persons.

Also, the City of Honolulu does not have enough police to adequately assure a quick enough response to a dangerous situation. The City of Honolulu should allow citizens to be always armed in all places to allow gun toting citizens to provide their own protection and protection for others.

For all these reasons, I oppose Bill 57.

Name: Jason Moore	Email: jasonohua@yahoo.com	Zip: 96815
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 01:38 PM

Name: SALVATORE LANZILOTTI	Email: slanzilotti@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 01:48 PM

Name: Dirck Sielken	Email: dsielken@hipco.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 02:12 PM

Testimony:

Aloha,

I strongly oppose House Bill057(22) as written. The beginning of this bill in a potion of Section 1 is accurate

"SECTION 1. Purpose. The purpose of this ordinance is to define those sensitive locations within the City and County of Honolulu ("City") where the carrying of firearms is prohibited, consistent with an individual's Second Amendment right to bear arms and

the United States Supreme Court's ruling in New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen, 142 S. Ct. 2111 (2022).

It is the further purpose of this ordinance to protect sensitive areas that have traditionally been subject to restrictions on carrying or possessing arms therein; to protect health, life, and property; and to preserve the order and security of the City, its inhabitants, and its visitors."

The should be only for sensitive spaces that have historical precedence. Everything else added for sensitive spaces makes it near impossible for a law-abiding citizen to legally carry their conceal carry firearm. The additional sensitive spaces listed in this bill have already been found to be unconstitutional. The additional sensitive spaces listed in this bill should be removed.

Why would you pass a bill when you swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. You are breaking your oath, knowingly and on purpose illegally denying law abiding citizen's their Constitutional Right.

YOUR OATH OF OFFICE YOU SWORE TO:

Section 4. All eligible public officers, before entering upon the duties of their respective offices, shall take and subscribe to the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of Hawaii, and that I will faithfully discharge my duties as to the best of my ability." As used in this section, "eligible public officers" means the governor, the lieutenant governor, the members of both houses of the legislature, the members of the board of education, the members of the national guard, State or county employees who possess police powers, district court judges, and all those whose appointment requires the consent of the senate. [Ren and am Const Con 1978 and election Nov 7, 1978; am SB 1440 (1992) and election Nov 3, 1992]

Please uphold your Oath of Office and the Constitution of the United States of America and vote no to this bill. Or amend it to Council Member Andria Tupola's Proposed draft BILL057(22), PROPOSED CD1 - ATUP1.

Thank you,
Dirck Sielken

Name: Cindy Delongchamp	Email: cdelongchamp1@hotmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 02:15 PM

Testimony:
This State already makes it virtually impossible to protect yourself without taking a costly class, background check and registration of any and all firearms you may have in your home for protection. If you have gone through background check and are approved, you should be able to carry a firearm anywhere for protection. Many people are shot and killed in places that are public areas all over this country. If someone were there that was a law abiding citizen and their life was threatened or anyone else's life was in danger, you should be able to deter that criminal if the police are no where to be found. Without that, you are going to have ALOT more crime.

Name: Gabriel Kekauoha	Email: gkekauoha16@gmail.com	Zip: 96712
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 02:16 PM

Testimony:
i oppose this bill as it is a clear violation of the 2nd Amendment.

Name: Willy Colt	Email: wheelgun.willy@gmail.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 03:16

		PM
--	--	----

Testimony:

Dear LawMakers,

Lawful gun owners do not break laws. Hawaii gun owners are ranked 4th least in the nation with 14.9% of adults having guns at home. (cbsnews) That is about 208,000 residents based on a total population of 1,400,000. These 208,000 residents are voters, lawyers, doctors, teachers, professionals and lawful citizens.

And gun deaths in Hawaii are at 2.5 deaths for every 100,000 residents. This figure is already one of the lowest in the nation.

Gun laws in Hawaii are very strict as they are. The proof is in the low numbers. No new laws are needed. More laws to restrict lawful citizens doesn't make sense. It would make it more difficult for lawful buyers and sellers of firearms. HPD would be further taxed by enforcing more laws. It would not make it harder for the bad guys. Criminals do not follow the law.

Sincerely,
Willy Colt

Name: Salvatore Lanzilotti	Email: slanzilotti@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 03:32 PM

Name: Jonagustine Lim	Email: jonagustine_lim@yahoo.com	Zip: 96818
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 03:45 PM

Testimony:

I write in opposition to this bill. It severely restricts a right, violates the constitution and criminalizes law abiding gun owners who have already gone through a lot of vetting process in getting the Hawaii CCW license. Please do not pass this bill. Thank you!

Name: JoAnn Salakielu	Email: joannsala956@yahoo.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 03:51 PM

Testimony:

I oppose this bill. It basically makes law-abiding, permitted gun owners criminals if they carry anywhere there except the sidewalk or where people are. This is not constitutional. These are the people that follow the law and have to go through training in order to carry their firearm.

Name: Cheryl Bellamy	Email: cbella4272@gmail.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 04:00 PM

Testimony:

I support bill 57 and I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to keep Hawaii safe and support the current bill!

Name: Laurie Freed	Email: lfreed@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 04:16

		PM
--	--	----

Testimony:

I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill. Thank you, very much.

Name: Kristine Chung	Email: krisnutritionist@gmail.com	Zip: 96813
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 04:31 PM

Testimony:

Aloha Executive Matters and Legal Affairs (EMLA) Committee,

My name is Kristine Chung, I am a senior citizen who has lived in Honolulu since 1989. I am in STRONG SUPPORT of Bill #057. It is very important to put in place appropriate safeguards to minimize the risk to our keiki & kupuna of the Supreme Court Beale decision allowing guns to be carried in public by many more people.

With more people now eligible to get permits to carry guns in public, we need to set clear boundaries on where they can and can't bring those guns.

Guns don't belong at playgrounds, parks, or schools, but without this bill, anyone who gets a concealed carry permit can bring hidden guns into those places.

Guns and alcohol should never mix. This bill will make it clear that people carrying guns in public cannot bring their guns to bars or restaurants serving alcohol.

We need to make sure law enforcement has the right information and authority to identify and deny public carry permits to people who pose a heightened public safety risk. People applying for these permits should be carefully evaluated based on objective criteria to ensure fairness and uniformity in the process.

Please vote your conscience; please protect our most vulnerable citizens with the common-sense guidelines in Bill 057.

Respectfully,

Kristine Chung

Name: Ryan Willis	Email: willis19.r@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 04:46 PM

Testimony:

This type of "sensitive place" prohibition has already been ruled unconstitutional in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of New York by Judge Suddaby in Antonyuk v. Nigrelli.

Examples of "sensitive place" designation not keeping criminals from doing criminal activity. Times Square is determined a "sensitive place" by the state of New York. They have had a stabbing at an arcade in MAY2022, Stabbing during New Year's Eve festivities on 31DEC2022 with heightened police presence, and just a deadly shooting on 10FEB2023.

Locally, 13FEB2023, HONOLULU (KHON2) – "There have been more than 700 crime incidents reported to Honolulu Police (HPD) within the past seven days." Clearly HPD is not equipped to protect every one at the same time, we need to have to option to protect ourselves.

Would we ever think about this type of prohibitions in respect to any other right of The People? Are the peoples rights limited in "sensitive places" when it comes to freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly as protected by the First amendment?

Schools have been a federal "sensitive place" since 1994, criminals target these places because they are a soft target and low to no resistance.

Criminals will continue to do criminal acts, while law abiding citizens have to abide the law.

Name: Crystal Willis	Email: ckwillis21@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 04:48 PM

Testimony:

This type of "sensitive place" prohibition has already been ruled unconstitutional in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of New York by Judge Suddaby in Antonyuk v. Nigrelli.

Examples of "sensitive place" destinations not keeping criminals from doing criminal activity. Times Square is determined a "sensitive place" by the state of New York. They have had a stabbing at an arcade in MAY2022, Stabbing during New Year's Eve festivities on 31DEC2022 with heightened police presence, and just a deadly shooting on 10FEB2023.

Locally, 13FEB2023, HONOLULU (KHON2) – "There have been more than 700 crime incidents reported to Honolulu Police (HPD) within the past seven days." Clearly HPD is not equipped to protect everyone at the same time, we need to have the option to protect ourselves.

Would we ever think about this type of prohibition in respect to any other right of The People? Are the peoples rights limited in "sensitive places" when it comes to freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly as protected by the First amendment?

Schools have been a federal "sensitive place" since 1994, criminals target these places because they are a soft target and low to no resistance.

Criminals will continue to do criminal acts, while law abiding citizens have to abide by the law.

Name: R Chun	Email: roghc@yahoo.com	Zip: 96795
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 04:50 PM

Testimony:

I am pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. Allowing guns to be carried in public in Hawaii, is a super serious decision, and I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Name: Lori Kizer	Email: lori_kizer@yahoo.com	Zip: 96746
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 04:54 PM

Testimony:

I support Bill 57 and humbly ask the City Council to also support this bill. Mahalo.

Name: Tamara Moan	Email: tamara.moan@yahoo.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 06:51 PM

Testimony:

I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
-------	--------	------

Matt Smith	matt96813@gmail.com	96813
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 06:51 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose the attempts of the council to re-write and restrict the laws of this great country. local law enforcement has shown they are not up to the task of keeping our streets safe and while they try they cannot be everywhere at the same time.</p> <p>That gives criminals free reign and our laughable justice system that punishes victims and releases criminals back onto the streets just makes them more bold.</p> <p>law abiding citizens need to have the basic human right to defend themselves and their families and criminals need to start learning that not everyone is defenseless.</p> <p>then crime rates will plummet, and you can have the courage to participate in lowering crime rates or you can be complicit in allowing it to grow by your actions.</p>		
Name: PHILIP LAPID	Email: lapid_philip@yahoo.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:01 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose this BILL 057. Unconstitutional and is PRO- Criminal mindset. A law abiding citizen with CCW Permit will conceal carry for protection for oneself, love ones, and others, who in an event that needs that kind of intervention. Otherwise, the person will not bother going through the application process if not for these SANE reasons. This BILL 057 will send message to the criminals that they can corrupt the system and with this law, they will know that nobody will shoot them back, they can shoot anyone and anywhere as long as it's not on the sidewalks. Reminder, criminals shoot potential victim/s on sidewalks just the same.</p>		
Name: Benel Piros	Email: soripleneb@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:16 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I OPPOSE due to the fact a LAW ABIDING Citizen is restricted to Lawfully carry and protect themselves at all times while in a public setting. Criminals don't follow the LAW and this Bill will do nothing to stop crime.</p>		
Name: Jerry Yuen	Email: jerry.t.yuen@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Pu'uoloa Rifle and Pistol Club	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:21 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I strongly oppose Bill 57. This bill will do nothing to stop violent crime and will only seek to disarm citizens that legally want to defend themselves. Gun free zones have proven repeatedly to not stop violent criminals and only provide the criminal with a the comfort of knowing that people have been disarmed for their convenience.</p>		
Name: Robert Pitman	Email: rgpitman96@gmsil.com	Zip: 96813
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:28 PM
<p>Testimony:</p>		

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Name: Rachel Lau	Email: rlau10@mac.com	Zip: 96816
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:33 PM

Testimony:
Dear Councilmembers,
I am writing in support of Bill 057, Relating to the Public Carry of Firearms. We must protect our citizens while restricting where guns can be carried in Honolulu. Guns have no place in sensitive areas in Honolulu. The bill includes schools, childcare facilities, public parks and many other areas as sensitive areas. Guns are the root cause of death in our country and Honolulu needs to be proactive in ensuring people are safe to go to school and play at the park, to name just a few. Thank you for considering my thoughts and moving this bill forward.
Mahalo,
Rachel H. Lau

Name: Robert Hechtman	Email: hechtman@gmail.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:40 PM

Testimony:
I Strongly Oppose Bill 57.

It is in direct violation of the 2nd amendment as seen in the Bruen decision that was passed recently by the supreme court.

It will only affect law abiding citizens by a defacto banning of concealed carry and means to protect themselves. Meanwhile criminals will carry firearms as they always have without any care for the law. Murder, Robbery, assault, rape are illegal and that has not stopped criminals from doing these things. Neither will this bill prevent them from carrying firearms illegally as they already have been doing.

The Crime Prevention Research Center has shown the data that Citizens with a concealed carry permit are the most law abiding members of society, including police officers.

Thank you for your time.
Again I strongly oppose this bill.

Name: Tam Cott	Email: tam3@hawaii.edu	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:46 PM

Testimony:
There is no evidence that anyone is safer in places where there is open carry. Period.

Name: Marya Grambs	Email: mgrambs@gmail.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 07:59 PM

Name: Valerie Smalley	Email: cherub42004@msn.com	Zip: 96821
--------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 08:29 PM
<p>Testimony: Aloha Councilmembers,</p> <p>I am a social worker and also a resident of Honolulu that has lived here for the last 37 years . Please pass the measures of bill 057 that will help Honolulu County continue to be a safer, sane place to live, work and to raise families. While violent crimes in other parts of the U.S are becoming heartbreaking and the current norm , lets not Honolulu go down that route. In Honolulu we are still horrified and shocked by gun violence which has occurred here and that is because it is rare. Bill 057 would keep guns out of locations where we congregate with our family and friends. Please help keep Honolulu County a safer , saner place to live.</p> <p>Thank You Valerie Smalley</p>		
Name: Mike Nguyen	Email: mnkdaddy808@gmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 08:56 PM
<p>Testimony: I oppose this bill as it a clear infringement upon our constitutional right to bear arms. No where in the constitution does it say "right to keep and bear arms except sensitive places" using the power of the law to force your ideals and those shared with like minded individuals should not be imposed on the majority. As law abiding citizens who comply within the law and pay money and devote time for qualifications should not be punished by unconstitutional restrictions when criminals are free to do as they please. Again I strongly oppose this bill</p>		
Name: Daniel Yoro	Email: bibinkarules@yahoo.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 09:07 PM
<p>Testimony: Uphold The Constitution or get out of office. Stop curtailing the rights of the People. Oppose Bill57. This only hurts law abiding citizens. Criminals will not abide any law. You all know this.</p>		
Name: Kathleen Triolo	Email: kathygla@gmail.com	Zip: 96816-3817
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 09:09 PM
<p>Testimony: Thank you City Council members for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:</p> <p>1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted at all public entrances if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties.</p> <p>2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness and drug addiction in these programs, this amendment is</p>		

important to help save lives.

The United States becomes more unsafe day by day - It has to stop. None of us is safe from the most horrifying phone call telling us our loved one has been killed by the hand of someone carrying a legal gun or an illegal one, take your choice. The body count continues to rise hour by hour so far this week. Let's keep Hawaii safer than all the other states.

Name: Bree Vellalos	Email: bree.vellalos@gmail.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 09:51 PM

Testimony:
I am opposed to this sensitive places bill. Restricting where a law abiding citizen can carry is unconstitutional. It violates our constitutional rights to bear arms and protect ourselves.

Name: Lynn Otaguro	Email: lmotaguro@yahoo.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 09:58 PM

Testimony:
I support the current bill that retains the important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. It will keep our communities safer. I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Name: Barbara Ritchie	Email: blritchie01@gmail.com	Zip: 96712
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:17 PM

Testimony:
Thank you City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:

1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties.
2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives.

Name: L Miles	Email: LesMs2021@gmail.com	Zip: 96749
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:28 PM

Testimony:
We oppose this bill as it is unconstitutional, and we see it as another attempt to infringe and chip away at American citizen's rights under the 2nd Amendment. The 2nd Amendment exists for a reason, and it does not contain conditions. We understand that people want to "feel safe" but to simply say "no guns allowed" does not mean criminals or those who are ill-intent will abide by the ban. Trying to create "safe zones" may just be giving people a false sense of security. Law-abiding citizens would respect the zones, however, you would make them more vulnerable because criminals do not care about laws or safe zones.
How would this be enforced? Will people be searched by someone for weapons in these locations? Will security be provided at

these locations? It seems you can't protect every single venue or school unless you build walls around them and have secure entry points.

With the rise in crime since our elected officials have decided that it would be good for society to be lenient on criminals, defund mental health services, defund police departments, let convicted criminals out of prison, do away with bail and not prosecute crimes, it's understandable that many people feel the need to take self-defense into their own hands. Why are you not writing bills to be "tough" on crime, especially gun-related crimes?

Many times we hear that the school shooters were "known to law enforcement." Yet after numerous reports of alarming behavior, nothing was done to restrict their access to firearms or provide mental health help. Why are you not writing bills to restrict persons with mental health issues access to firearms, and enacting measures to provide desperately needed mental health and drug treatment services? Why is the "solution" always to go after the law-abiding, background-checked, trained and permitted firearm owners who haven't committed any crimes?

While we support common-sense firearm laws such as background checks, training and licensing, we oppose such a broad bill as this, as it violates law-abiding citizen's 2nd Amendment rights and does not guarantee anyone's safety.

Name: RYAN TINAJERO	Email: ryan.c.tinajero@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:43 PM

Name: Erica Yamauchi	Email: aloha@ericayamauchi.com	Zip: 96816
Representing: Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America -- Hawai'i Chapter	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 10:52 PM

Name: Jacob Holcomb	Email: jake@mailbox.org	Zip: 96819
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 20, 2023 @ 11:28 PM

Testimony:
If you double down on policies that punish the law abiding while rewarding criminality then crime will continue to get worse. It's not difficult math, folks.

Name: Wilfred Lum	Email: ahaolelo@yahoo.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 05:23 AM

Testimony:
I stand in opposition of bill 057 as it is written due to the fact that it allows very little areas where a lawfully, permitted concealed carry citizen may defend themselves or others. I understand that some areas are without reproach such as the courthouse and airport. However, one cannot deny the fact that crime happens everywhere and at anytime. Criminals are committing brazen crimes of assault and battery during the daytime knowing full well that their victims cannot defend themselves.

If you read the requirements on how someone obtains a permit to conceal carry on Oahu you will see that the only people that will be allowed to get them are citizens who are law abiding. There are a lot of "hoops" that will need to be met and only the ones that pass all of them will be allowed to carry a concealed weapon. Criminals will not go through this process and will continue to break the law. Being able to have the means to defend one's self and others will allow citizens the means to survive in the event of a violent act.

Name: nancy Sidun	Email: n.sidun@hawaiiantel.net	Zip: 96825
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:

Self	Support	Feb 21, 2023 @ 05:50 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Thank you City Council members for all that you have done to create a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. I fully support Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:</p> <p>1. For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require "clear and conspicuous signage" to be posted if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties.</p> <p>2. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Dr. Nancy Sidun</p>		
Name: William laela	Email: william.laela@gmail.com	Zip: 96816
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 06:50 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to submit this testimony in opposition to Bill 057(22) on the grounds that it is a violation of the 2nd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as well as the 14th Amendment, which provides for equal protection under the law. This bill provides differential treatment to certain individuals as evidenced in Sec. 40 _4 (c) (1) and (2).</p> <p>This Bill, at first glance, seeks to create "Safe Spaces" but even a cursory overview of the facts of shooting incidents, both mass or otherwise but especially mass shooting events, show that the criminals committed their crimes in what were considered "gun free zones."</p> <p>The shooting in the mall in El Paso, Texas on 15February2023, just last week, on the same block where the 2019 Walmart mass shooting occurred in which a criminal murdered 23 people, was stopped by an armed citizen legally carrying concealed who took action to stop the threat as quickly as possible once the threat was identified and confirmed. Compare that to the Michigan State University lockdown that had students cowering in rooms for hours because a murderer could walk their "gun free" campus at will hunting for victims at his leisure.</p> <p>This Bill serves only to place such onerous restrictions on legal CCW gun owners as to be a de facto ban hidden under the guise of "common sense safety limits." Please vote NO on BILL057(22).</p> <p>William laela</p>		
Name: Estella Berg	Email: estellaberg@gmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:01 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.</p>		
Name: Michael Leong	Email: mleonginhawaii@gmail.com	Zip: 96816

Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:13 AM
Name: Bonnie Tokita	Email: bonniet1970@gmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:14 AM
<p>Testimony: I support Bill 57. The majority of Oahu residents do not carry guns around. I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.</p>		
Name: Barbara Fischlowitz-Leong	Email: barbinhawaii@gmail.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Assistive Technology Resource Centers of Hawaii	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:19 AM
Name: Rik Rutt	Email: rikkirutt@yahoo.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:31 AM
<p>Testimony: I am strongly opposed to the proposal. First off, we have already seen similar restrictions already beginning to be overturned in the courts. By prohibiting carry by licensed individuals in public areas goes completely against the ruling of the supreme court. Also, only law-abiding individuals will obey (the responsible people that will not be the source of problems) resulting in the rules providing no safety. Another issue with the proposed rules is that on prohibitions on private property. The ruling the courts issues determined that carrying a firearm outside of the home is a constitutionally protected right. That is the default, and if an individual does not want to allow that on their private property it is their right to post such. The default being no carry permitted unless explicitly stated is a blatant disregard of the ruling of the supreme court. The proposed rules are unconstitutional and go against recent supreme court and other court rulings (let alone provide absolutely no benefits to public safety and potentially hurt that issue). An added issue is that these rules will be challenged in the courts and as we have seen have precedence to be overturned which will only end up costing the residence of the City and County of Honolulu through the waste of public funds to fight the challenges to the proposed rules. I hope that the Council use logic and facts and do not pass this bill.</p>		
Name: Ann Renick	Email: arenick8@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:42 AM
<p>Testimony: I am in STRONG support of Bill 57, and would like for the the council to add: 1. Make signage mandatory, and make it clear and conspicuous. 2. Given the mental health issues and histories of violence for those at the following places, Add these facilities: adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults.</p> <p>Mahalo</p>		
Name: Bryston Tanigawa	Email: brystont1@hotmail.com	Zip: 96797
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:47

		AM
<p>Testimony: Terrible law that affects only law abiding citizens. Criminals will not follow. Follow your oaths and respect SCOTUS ruling.</p>		
<p>Name: Tai Horen</p>	<p>Email: taihoren@icloud.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96744</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 08:06 AM</p>
<p>Testimony: I oppose bill057</p>		
<p>Name: Robert Marks</p>	<p>Email: rmarks808@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96816</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 08:51 AM</p>
<p>Testimony: This bill retains the most important “default” provision as well as the list of other “sensitive places” where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.</p>		
<p>Name: Connie Mitchell</p>	<p>Email: conniem@ihshawaii.org</p>	<p>Zip: 96817</p>
<p>Representing: The Institute for Human Services</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 08:52 AM</p>
<p>Name: Tod Gushiken</p>	<p>Email: tod.gushiken@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 98614</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:06 AM</p>
<p>Name: Jennifer Taylor</p>	<p>Email: jennifertaylor_us@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96825</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:09 AM</p>
<p>Testimony: Mahalo, City Councilmembers for your hard work creating a good Sensitive Places bill for Hawaii. Hawaii is currently a safe haven amidst a landscape of increasing gun violence on the mainland. Carrying guns in our city is the antithesis of Aloha and should be limited as much as possible. I am in strong support of Bill 57, and request your consideration of amendments to strengthen for Bill 57:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For non-profit and commercial establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property, please require “clear and conspicuous signage” to be posted if property owners want to allow firearms to be carried on the property (rather than making such signage optional), so that the public can take appropriate measures to protect themselves from being on such properties. I do not want my loved ones entering any business that allows guns to be carried on its premises. "Sensitive Places" is currently defined to include homeless shelters, juvenile justice programs and programs for at-risk juveniles, but there is no similar protection for adult homeless shelters, adult correctional system programs, and programs for at-risk adults. Given the prevalence of persons experiencing mental illness, drug addiction and/or histories of violent tendencies in these programs, this amendment is important to help save lives. 		

Many thanks for everything you do.

Jennifer Taylor
274 Poipu Drive
808 396 2172

Name: PAMELA SUMMERS	Email: xfer0@msn.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:21 AM

Testimony:
I support bill 57.

I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.

Name: Jordan Au	Email: jordan-726@hotmail.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:54 AM

Testimony:
To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose Bill 57. This bill will make it illegal for people to carry a firearm for protection almost everywhere they go. The Bruen decision said laws have to follow text, history, and tradition of the second amendment dating back to the late 1700s. During that time it was legal to carry a firearm in many of the places listed on this bill. Furthermore, this bill will not keep anyone safe. Many shootings have taken place where carrying firearms was prohibited. While in areas where firearms are allowed many people have stepped up and stopped those shootings before it got out of hand. People who conceal carry just want to keep everyone safe.

Thank you

Name: JOHN D'ADAMO	Email: dadamo@hawaiiantel.net	Zip: 96795
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:59 AM

Testimony:
I oppose Bill 057
Unconstitutional and it will only end up in court.
The cost will be on the taxpayer.

Name: Mitchell Weber	Email: mdotweber@gmail.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 10:02 AM

Testimony:
I strongly Oppose Bill57.

Name: Tony Frascarelli	Email: tfras89012@gmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:

Self	Oppose	Feb 21, 2023 @ 10:15 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am opposed to this bill as it is a lengthy, well written attempt to circumvent the recent US Supreme Court Bruen ruling. As a senior citizen it saddens me that our lawmakers continue to restrict or prohibit the public from doing whatever they can to protect ourselves and our loved ones. Every day I read or hear about assaults, muggings, home invasions and other crime's happening on our streets and in our neighborhoods. The provisions in this Bill would severely limit ones ability to purchase and carry a concealed weapon. This Bill is designed to discourage someone from even attempting to purchase a firearm or to go through the permitting process. Why spend the time and money to complete training and qualification if the only place you can carry your concealed weapon in on a public sidewalk. As someone who held a concealed firearms license during the many years I lived in NV, I agree that there are places that should be restricted such as certain schools, courts and hospitals, but not in places where a number of crimes occur like parks.</p> <p>It's unfortunate that the proponents of this measure did not take the time to contact or review what other mainland jurisdictions did in deciding where to limit concealed carry rather than put together a bill to try and invalidate the US Supreme Court ruling. Thank you.</p>		
Name: Justin Nakamoto	Email: Justinnofearnakamoto@gmail.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 10:28 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I'm against this bill because I feel like it we should be able to conceal carry in everyday life. Such as restaurants,gas stations, grocery stores ect. Crime happens all over and all the time. Crime doesn't stop, And i would like a fighting chance to protect my self and my family at all times in everyday life. Also knowing that places will be way more safer with the practice of trained conceal carry weapons. Bad things happen everywhere so why restrict us. I'm against this bill and I just want to protect my family. Thank you for your time.</p>		
Name: PAUL WHITE	Email: phwhite@pacbell.net	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 10:29 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I congratulate the Councilmembers for taking the initiative and proposing lto prohibit open carry of firearms in "Sensitive Places". I also suggest strengthening the proposed bill in a couple of ways to require signage if a prroprietor wnts to allow open carry on the premises, and to be sure the protections for homeless shelters include adult shelters.</p>		
Name: Stefanie Sakamoto	Email: ssakamoto@imanaka-asato.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Hawaii Credit Union League	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 11:43 AM
Name: Lynne Johnson	Email: cometkupon@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 11:53 AM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am a fifth generation Kamaaina and have relatives on every major island. I love Hawaii am very proud of Hawaii's relatively few gun-related deaths,, which has much to do with the laws we have in place. There is this belief that more guns means greater safety. This is what the gun manufacturers are trying to get you to believe. The truth is just the opposite. The more guns that are permitted to be carried around the greater the risk for everyone. I totally support this bill to limit the areas where concealed guns can be carried. I would even like to see a gun buy back program, which the police department had in the past. I. At one time,</p>		

smoking was considered cool. Now we realize that it is dangerous for your health, even second hand smoke is dangerous. I would love to see an ad campaign that shows the havoc guns have wreaked in our society. It has become an epidemic. Owning a gun is not cool. It is stupid. When I was ten a neighbor was killed by a cousin of cousin of mine, one ten, the other twelve, while playing with a loaded gun. It was devastating for both families. I support Bill 057(22).

Name: Valerie Wayne	Email: vwayne@hawaii.edu	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 12:01 PM

Testimony:
I would like to thank the City Councilmembers for creating a good bill to address the carrying of firearms in sensitive places in Hawaii. I strongly support this bill because it will make some places in our community safer. I also request that you consider amendments to make it even stronger in two respects.
(1) Please require, rather than make optional, signage in the establishments that allow firearms to be carried on their property so that members of the public can protect themselves adequately. The signs should be clear and conspicuous and posted at all public entrances.
(2) Please extend the definition of "sensitive places" to include ADULT homeless shelters (this is so important for women who have experienced domestic violence!), ADULT correctional system programs, and those programs for at-risk ADULTS. It's not only young people who are at risk from firearms. Adults need protection as well, as recent shootings have shown.
Thank you for considering these requests.

Name: Mark Bacatat	Email: slammed_toy@hotmail.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 12:45 PM

Testimony:
Oppose

Name: Peter Roa	Email: daveselectric808@gmail.com	Zip: 96759
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 12:48 PM

Testimony:
Oppose

Name: Adrian Flack	Email: Adrianflack@live.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 12:52 PM

Testimony:
I strongly oppose bill 57

Name: Rob Mihada	Email: onebeegfakka@gmail.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 12:58 PM

Testimony:
I strongly oppose this Bill as it's simply unconstitutional as per Bruen and Heller. Bruen specifically states that any law or limitation to keep and bear arms must have historical precedent from when the 2nd amendment was ratified in 1791 or re-ratified 1868. The

burden is on the state to prove their laws and limitations are based on those historical precedents. Justice Thomas wrote in Bruen: The right to keep and bear arms in public for self defense is not "a 2nd class right, subject to an entirely different set of rules than the other Bill of Rights guarantees." If you do not stand by the Constitution, you do not belong in your position. We are a Constitutional Republic, not a democracy. The law clearly states "shall not be infringed [...]". the Constitution protects individual liberties from being abused by the government. A significant accomplishment of the Constitution was finding a means to agree on this basis of power. Any where you limit the ability to conceal carry makes the people in those locations, the most vulnerable. Gun owners are by far the most patriotic, responsible, and law abiding citizens. Criminals do not care about the law nor safe spaces. It only makes our community more vulnerable [...].

I am a law abiding citizen.

The 2nd Amendment protects my right to carry a firearm so that I may protect myself.

Bills like this do not support my rights as an American Citizen.

Bills like this actively restrict my rights and the rights of all Americans.

These laws empower and encourage criminals.

The average police response time can be anywhere from 3 minutes to 15 minutes, by that time I could be beaten, raped or killed.

Do not restrict my ability to protect myself or my family.

It is your responsibility to encourage your citizens to protect themselves and their community.

Unless your goal is to make your citizens victims.

Name: Kasy Newman	Email: kasyfaye@gmail.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:21 PM

Testimony:
I oppose bill 57

Name: Shaun Duldulao	Email: shaunduldulao@yahoo.com	Zip: 96819
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:27 PM

Testimony:
Oppose

Name: Nalu Boersma	Email: naluoner@gmail.com	Zip: 97644
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:28 PM

Testimony:
I strongly oppose this bill.

Name: Deven English	Email: kamea6@gmail.com	Zip: 96706
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:34 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill

Name: Ryan Filler	Email: ryanisfuller1808@gmail.com	Zip: 96786
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:

HTD	Oppose	Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:35 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose this bill because it is unconstitutional. Mass shootings happen in gun free zones! Criminals conduct crime in gun free zones and this bill gives the upper hand to criminals cause they know law abiding citizens will not have a firearm for self defense. A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed. And this bill infringes on out 2A rights.</p>		
Name: Shane Um	Email: sppksu@gmail.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:35 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose the bill</p>		
Name: Pamela Menter	Email: pamelamenter@yahoo.com	Zip: 96795
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:35 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill.</p>		
Name: Clinton Lewe-Song	Email: Clinton@HoomaluResearchAndDevelopment.com	Zip: 96755
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:41 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Any possible restriction of constitutional rights must be carefully considered to ensure that they do not infringe on individual freedoms or erode the principles of democracy.</p> <p>Courts in successful communities have determined that these types restrictions of concealed carry are infringements, as communities that insist on these violations are experiencing horribly increasing crime rates. This indicates that the consideration does not meet any positive goal. It is the worst of both worlds to place restrictions on lawful citizens that will, in turn, foster a crime friendly environment.</p> <p>Saying that one intends on protecting constitutional rights while crafting de facto violations is unacceptable. Choosing to subscribe to that plan is following the deteriorating path of failing urban centers across the US. The increase of restrictions has done nothing to decrease violence, and are obvious components of continued decline.</p> <p>I urge you to oppose Bill 57 and any other continued restriction of constitutional rights.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Clinton Lewe-Song</p>		
Name: Kent Shiraki	Email: kds471@yahoo.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:44 PM

<p>Testimony: I would like to submit my opposition to this bill as a law abiding citizen, who would like to exercise a right as afforded under the 2nd Amendment of the United States Constitution.</p>		
<p>Name: Donovan Sun</p>	<p>Email: jahlive85@fmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96826</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:58 PM</p>
<p>Testimony: Aloha Honolulu City Council Members,</p> <p>I oppose BILL057(22). It violates the second amendment stated by the supreme court in the NYSRP vs. Bruen case. How will the city pay for the lawsuits they will get if it passes? We have seen time and time again that gun free zones don't work. They only create a place for criminals to prey on law-abiding unarmed citizens. Criminals don't follow laws to begin with. What makes you think they will follow this?</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Donovan Sun</p>		
<p>Name: Mufi Hannemann</p>	<p>Email: mhannemann@hawaiilodging.org</p>	<p>Zip: 96815</p>
<p>Representing: Hawaii Lodging & Tourism Association</p>	<p>Position: Support</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 01:59 PM</p>
<p>Name: Kelvin Asahina</p>	<p>Email: kelasadds@aol.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96814</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:11 PM</p>
<p>Testimony: Last year SCOTUS decided that it is a constitutional right to carry a firearm in public. I'm sure you all know about this decision yet our Hawaii law makers keep trying to pass laws that contradict that ruling by SCOTUS. How much more will this cost taxpayers when more lawsuits are filed against the State? Furthermore, who are these new laws you are trying to pass going to affect? Again and again we have to argue that no criminal will care about any new law you pass which will only affect law abiding citizens who are being attacked left and right on our streets. We should have a right and means to protect ourselves especially since our judicial system is a revolving door for people who chose to break the law on a regular basis. I am opposed to this bill for these reasons.</p>		
<p>Name: David Ruiz</p>	<p>Email: Ruizd004@hawaii.rr.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96741</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:32 PM</p>
<p>Testimony: Shall not infringe!</p>		
<p>Name: Edwin Wise</p>	<p>Email: ewise911@gmail.com</p>	<p>Zip: 96782</p>
<p>Representing: Self</p>	<p>Position: Oppose</p>	<p>Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:44 PM</p>
<p>Testimony:</p>		

I oppose this bill and any bill's that includes firearms because it's my constitutional rights to bare arms I'm a law abiding citizen and will exercise my rights.

Name: Edward Inn	Email: edwardinn@ymail.com	Zip: 96818
---------------------	-------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:44 PM
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:
This goes against my constitutional rights as a law abiding citizen 2A supporter

Name: Kaikea Ka-ne Broadfoot	Email: kaikeaknb@gmail.com	Zip: 96821
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:44 PM
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:
Crime and danger in Hawaii is getting worse and this bill is pretty much benefitting the criminals. It's like giving them the path to harm innocent people because they know it's a "gun free zone". It's unconstitutional and wrong.

Name: Sara Deguchi	Email: ichigo@hawaii.rr.com	Zip: 96818
-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:54 PM
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:
I oppose this

Name: Ashley Alaelua	Email: afatasi.moni@gmail.com	Zip: 96826
-------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:57 PM
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:
I oppose Bill057(22)!

Name: Gabrielle Davidson	Email: the_gab_@hotmail.com	Zip: 96703
-----------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 02:57 PM
-----------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:
I am very pleased that the current bill retains the most important "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask the Council to support the current bill. Thank you!

Name: Angelika Sielken	Email: angelikasielken@gmail.com	Zip: 96789
---------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 03:08 PM
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Testimony:
I am opposing this bill as written.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
-------	--------	------

Deb Nehmad	debnehmad@bradyunited.org	96825
Representing: Brady Hawaii	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 03:11 PM
Name: Eugene Cruz	Email: ginoraiders@gmail.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 03:14 PM
Testimony: I oppose this Bill		
Name: Silverio Alejandro	Email: pollux_iii@hotmail.com	Zip: 96782
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 03:19 PM
Testimony: I strongly oppose Bill 57 because it undermines the purpose of concealed carrying a firearm by severely limiting the areas where it's allowed. Also, this bill only restricts law abiding citizens from protecting him or herself, criminals don't care about laws, they break them all the time and they'll break this one too.		
Name: 'Ilima DeCosta	Email: adecosta808@icloud.com	Zip: 96815
Representing: Hale Ola Spa & Apothecary	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 03:39 PM
<p>Testimony: TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF BILL057(22)</p> <p>TO: Chair Waters and members of the Honolulu City Council</p> <p>FROM: 'Ilima DeCosta Owner, Hale Ola Spa & Apothecary</p> <p>DATE: February 22, 2023 (10:00am)</p> <p>Mahalo for the opportunity to testify in strong support of Bill 57, Relating to the Public Carry of Firearms. Bill 57 would codify where and when a firearm licensee may carry a concealed firearm, by clarifying which locations are prohibited for concealed carry.</p> <p>I am a mother whose adult daughter was shot and killed due to domestic related gun violence, and I am also a business owner.</p> <p>The people who visit my establishment are seeking health and relaxation, and the presence of firearms at our business would undermine the sanctuary of this space.</p> <p>Presently, the default law for concealed carry states that NO firearms are allowed into any business establishment without the express permission of the business owner. This means that business owners do not need to post "No firearm" signs, and this should remain the standard, default rule, law, or practice.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there are some in our community who want to test the rules and laws, by carrying their firearms concealed AND unconcealed into the state Capitol, during a recent hearing. The person who carried their unconcealed firearm into last week's legislative hearing claimed he has a permit to carry a firearm unconcealed and that he didn't realize firearms weren't allowed in</p>		

the Capitol.

Ignorance is no excuse for breaking the law, and the individual who carried an unconcealed firearm into the Capitol should have been immediately arrested.

The presence of firearms in the hands of civilians visiting government buildings is not acceptable to me and shouldn't be acceptable to our legislative leadership.

The presence of firearms in government buildings, medical facilities and private businesses is an anathema to public safety. I urge the Honolulu City Council to pass Bill 57 and fulfill their duty to protect the public health.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify in support of this bill.

Name: Betsey Strauss	Email: bets10@icloud.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 03:44 PM

Testimony:
One of the reasons I live in Hawaii is because of our stringent laws regarding firearms. Guns are absolutely not necessary at schools and parks where our keiki play. Please vote YES!!

Name: David Schafer	Email: covers67@yahoo.com	Zip: 96786
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 04:27 PM

Testimony:
I am against any further restrictions on my 2nd amendment rights. No more.

Name: Shaun Lee	Email: shaun96734@gmail.com	Zip: 96734
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 04:37 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill.

Name: Sue Hornik	Email: suehornik@gmail.com	Zip: 96815
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 04:40 PM

Name: sherry fisher	Email: ponoparenting@gmail.com	Zip: 96768
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 04:42 PM

Testimony:
We need to continue to protect the people of Hawaii by enacting strict laws around firearms in our state. Please support protective measures for our citizens by regulating firearms. Background checks, mental health assessments, waiting periods. Mahalo sherry fisher

Name:	Email:	Zip:
-------	--------	------

Ted Baldonado	baldonado.ted@gmail.com	96817
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 05:17 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I OPPOSE Bill 57. I DO NOT agree to proposed changes in the bill.</p> <p>Allowing appropriate signage should be to dissuade the carrying of concealed pistols/revolvers. If a business does not want concealed carry in the facility, then they should have "No firearms allowed signs" verses having signage to allow for the practice. By mandating that signs are required for entry, this allows for business to be targeted by opposing groups. How are we (responsible citizen) are to defend ourselves with our chosen form.</p> <p>I oppose the restriction of my ability to carry written in this bill. I approve of the historical location of places where firearms are not allowed: Schools, Government buildings, court houses, legislative assemblies and pooling places. Public parks and transportation are main areas where we are targeted. As a public transport user, this greatly inhibits my ability to conduct daily activities and I am left defenseless in such an event.</p> <p>I hope this bill can be revised with the aid of those who the currently bill can potentially affect. As stated before. I OPPOSE this current bill.</p> <p>Ted Baldonado</p>		
Name: Eric Taramasco	Email: etaramasco@msn.com	Zip: 96707
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 05:52 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>To whom it may Concern;</p> <p>Since I must work and could not get the time off work I would like to submit my comments for to be included as Testimony against Honolulu City Council Bill 57- Regarding the locations of where Conceal Carry may go.</p> <p>Conceal Handguns Deter Crime and with rising crime rates the Law-abiding Citizens the CCW allows them to protect themselves. My current understanding of this proposed bill will inhibit the law-abiding citizens of a proven way of protection.</p> <p>In landmark Study that analyzed FBI crime data it found that states implemented conceal carry reduced murders by 8.5%, Rapes by 5% aggravated assaults by 7% robberies by 3 %. Study after Study has shown that areas that there is a significant population of the private citizenry that have conceal carry have some of the lowest rates of crime.</p> <p>A legal and certified Conceal Carry individual keeps the public safer. It has been proven time and time again where a conceal carry individual has assisted in keeping other non-carrying individuals from being seriously injured or killed.</p> <p>Conceal Carry handguns protect women and minorities who can't always rely on the police for protection. Many times police are not where the crime is being committed when an individual who has taken classes and certified to carry a concealed weapon they are able to protect themselves when law enforcement is not around help or assist.</p>		
Name: Casey Nakama	Email: casey_nakama@hotmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 06:05 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I oppose this bill.</p>		
Name: Michael Golojuch, Jr.	Email: michael@hawaiidemocrats.org	Zip: 96707
Representing: Stonewall Caucus of the Democratic Party of Hawaii	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:13 PM

Testimony:

Aloha Councilmembers,

The Stonewall Caucus of the Democratic Party of Hawai'i; Hawai'i's oldest and largest policy and political LGBTQIA+ focused organization fully supports Bill 57 (22).

We hope you all will support this important piece of legislation.

Mahalo nui loa,

Michael Golojuch, Jr.
Chair and SCC Representative
Stonewall Caucus for the DPH

Name: Jason Yamasaki	Email: 2aalldaway@gmail.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:29 PM

Testimony:
I oppose this bill

Name: Andrew Namiki Roberts	Email: info@hifico.org	Zip: 96815
Representing: Hawaii Firearms Coalition	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 07:41 PM

Testimony:
Aloha Council members

I am writing to you today as a director of Hawaii Firearms Coalition. Hawaii Firearms Coalition represents the interest of its members and Hawaii's more than one hundred thousand registered law-abiding gun owners and is writing today in Opposition to BILL0 57(22).

In June of 2022, the Supreme court ruled that legal firearms owners have a right to carry a firearm for self-defense. In response, Bill 57 was introduced at the bequest of the Mayor.

Firstly we feel that the county is not the right place to be passing laws on sensitive places, and instead, the law should be created at the state level. Having each county with different laws will create confusion for residents and likely lead to otherwise law-abiding citizens facing lengthy prison sentences.

A state-level law would also remove the legal liabilities from any lawsuit that the county will face should you pass this law without significant amendments.

HIFICOs suggested sensitive places:

We do not disagree that the carrying of firearms can be prohibited in some locations. However, laws doing so MUST be limited in scope. As such, we would like to provide our suggested changes to Bill 57, followed by the reasoning as to why.

We believe that the list of places considered sensitive should be restricted to the following:

Court buildings: Excluding parking structures

Schools and daycares: Except that a licensed individual who is dropping off or picking up a child may carry concealed within the confines of their vehicle in the parking lot or designated pick up or drop off area.

Poling places (during poling): Excluding parking structures

Prisons and jails: Excluding parking structures

Legislative assemblies (Honolulu Hale): Excluding parking structures

Airports (beyond the security checkpoints)

These places have traditionally been seen as places where firearms are prohibited and fit within the text, history, and tradition guidelines as laid out by the supreme court.

We further agree that Private businesses may prohibit the carrying of a firearm on their property BUT that they must post a conspicuous sign on EVERY entrance and exit meeting the following standards:

Be at least 10 inches wide and 10 inches tall.

Have a yellow background.

Be located at least 24 inches from the ground.

Contain a pictogram that shows a firearm within a red circle and a diagonal red line across the firearm.

Contain the wording "no firearms allowed" in black letters at least 1 inch in height

These standards are to ensure that an otherwise law-abiding citizen does not accidentally break the law because of a sign that is too small or hidden.

The punishment for violating these signs should be a Fine (but at most a petty misdemeanor). But only after the person has been asked to leave and has refused or failed to do so.

All other places should be removed from the bill as they do not fit within the confines of sensitive places and, as such, would violate the rights of Honolulu's residents.

Methodology for creating our position.

The supreme court in Heller and NYSPRA provided a set of guidelines as to the types of places that may be considered sensitive. Among the places are legislative assemblies, polling places, schools, and courthouses.

For other places to be added to the list, they must fit within certain criteria. Fitting within the Text, history, and traditions of the second amendment. Have a legitimate purpose and be places where the government provides for the safety of the public.

When applying the Text history and tradition approach, the supreme court has said it becomes the burden of the lawmakers to defend the law. The lawmaker must find and prove a historical analogy to the law they are passing, and it must be widespread (traditional).

When looking at the history of law, it must be found it must be between the ratification of the constitution in 1791 and the reconstruction of 1861. The argument that Hawaii banned the public carrying of firearms for 190 years is not justification for passing Bill 57, but it does stand as evidence that the state acknowledges it was violating the rights of its citizens.

Many of the locations listed in Bill 57 have been included in laws in other cities and states. All of which have had an injunction placed on them when challenged in court. These include bans on private property, Public transport, Restaurants, Bars, Public parks, Playgrounds, Places of Sojourn, and areas where others are conducting free speech activities. None of the places have a historical and traditional equivalent when applying the tests provided by the Supreme Court in Bruen.

Furthermore, the extensive list provided in Bill 57 would cause most people to not be able to carry firearms in their day-to-day life and serve no purpose to public safety. Having to disarm for an entire day because you need to pay your registration, visit a doctor, or take your child to school would violate a person's right to bear arms.

We hope that you take our position to heart when considering your position on Bill 57 and hope to work more with each one of you moving forward.

Andrew Namiki Roberts

Director Hawaii Firearms Coalition.

info@hifico.org

Name: Chase Agon	Email: chaseagon@gmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 08:00 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Limiting the right for law abiding concealed carry citizens to not be able to carry in "sensitive areas" will not stop crime from happening in these areas because criminals don't and will not follow any laws like these. Citizens that go through all the hoops to get a concealed carry permit aren't going to be the ones committing crimes, they just want to be able to protect themselves and their loved ones in a world that seems to be getting more dangerous every day. Certain places like schools, courthouses, police stations and government buildings are acceptable to be deemed sensitive areas but besides that, there should be no restricted areas for concealed carry</p>		
Name: Noelani Schilling-Wheeler	Email: noelani@visit-oahu.com	Zip: 96815
Representing: O'ahu Visitors Bureau	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 08:24 PM
Name: Paul Cudal	Email: hawaiitacticaldivision@gmail.com	Zip: 96819
Representing: Hawaii Tactical Division LLC.	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 08:33 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Im just gonna make this short and simple. This bill doesn't make sense because people will or is already carrying without your permission and I'm referring to those who don't obey the law which are criminals. WE THE PEOPLE actually have to apply basically ask permission to LEGALLY CARRY which is upright WRONG! IT IS OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT and it is TYRANNICAL OF YOU GUYS to make that decision to where we cant carry in a public space for us LAW ABIDING CITIZENS IN OUR BELOVED HOME HAWAI'I.</p> <p>THERE ISNT ENOUGH LAW ENFORCEMENT TO PROTECT ME OR MY LOVED ONES OUT IN PUBLIC SO IT IS OUR HUMAN/CONSTITUTION RIGHTS TO PROTECT MY LOVED ONES BECAUSE CRIME IS ON THE RISE.</p> <p>INSTEAD OF INFRINGING ON OUR RIGHTS, YOU GUYS SHOULD FOCUS ON THE REAL PROBLEM TO ACTUALLY KEEP CRIMINALS BEHIND BARS, INSTEAD OF JUST RELEASING THEM BACK INTO SOCIETY.</p> <p>Make common sense make sense again because I don't understand why criminals have more rights than us good people.</p>		
Name: Gaurachandra Bull	Email: gaur.usa@icloud.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:28 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Unconstitutional</p>		
Name: Sarah Sumadi	Email: ssumadi@everytown.org	Zip: 98146
Representing: Everytown for Gun Safety	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:35 PM
Name: Alejandro Montoya	Email: alikh.96797@gmail.com	Zip: 96797

Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:38 PM
Testimony: Law abiding citizens should have the right to bear arms.		
Name: Matthew Coleman	Email: mwkc117@gmail.com	Zip: 96817
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:40 PM
Testimony: Goes against my second amendment rights. Just doesn't make sense.		
Name: Jev Vaughn Elliston	Email: jevvaughnelliston@yahoo.com	Zip: 96818
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 09:47 PM
Testimony: America is the country of free, loving law abiding citizens and residents which should have right to protect themselves and also their subordinates in and out of public. Therefore, carrying firearms is not a bad idea to do so. Therefore I do oppose.		
Name: Alejandro Munoz	Email: fixdoc88@aol.com	Zip: 96791
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 10:17 PM
Testimony: I oppose BILL057, as this would make it easier for criminals to prey on innocent people, public areas, who will not be able to defend themselves.		
Name: Allegra Giacchino	Email: allegrag@hotmail.com	Zip: 96816
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 10:48 PM
Testimony: I am a Honolulu resident writing in strong support of Bill 057. Guns have no place in sensitive areas such as schools, playgrounds, bars, and restaurants. Gun violence is a public health epidemic in this country. Other developed nations do not live and die like this. We must be proactive in maintaining the safety of our city. Please pass Bill 057. Mahalo.		
Name: John Terry	Email: jack4002@me.com	Zip: 96744
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 21, 2023 @ 11:09 PM
Testimony: Testimony Text: I am opposed to Bill 57. Based upon the SCOTUS BRUEN decision, Bill 57 would violate the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens to bear arms in public for self-defense. The Constitutional right to bear arms in public for self-defense is not "a second-class right, subject to an entirely different body of rules than the other Bill of Rights guarantees." (McDonald, 561 U. S., at 780 (plurality opinion). The exercise of other constitutional rights does not require individuals to demonstrate to		

government officers some special need. The Second Amendment right to carry arms in public for self-defense is no different. The supreme court reiterates that the standard for applying the Second Amendment is as follows: When the Second Amendment's plain text covers an individual's conduct, the Constitution presumptively protects that conduct. The government must then justify its regulation by demonstrating that it is consistent with the Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation. "Legislative assemblies, polling places, and courthouses," which the Court tells us were among the "relatively few" places "where weapons were altogether prohibited" in the 18th and 19th centuries. It is true that people sometimes congregate in "sensitive places," and it is likewise true that law enforcement professionals are usually presumptively available in those locations. But expanding the category of "sensitive places" simply to all places of public congregation that are not isolated from law enforcement defines the category of "sensitive places" far too broadly. The Second Amendment was adopted in 1791; "Constitutional rights are enshrined with the scope they were understood to have when the people adopted them." Heller, 554 U. S., at 634–635 (emphasis added) Consistent with the SCOTUS BRUEN decision, the burden falls on the state of Hawaii to show that the State's proposed sensitive place requirement is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulations beyond those outlined above by the Court when the Second Amendment was adopted in 1791. The passing of Bill 57 would be in direct defiance of the SCOTUS and will violate the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens to bear arms in public for self-defense. Thank you, John Terry

Name: Evelyn Hao	Email: evyhao@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 12:47 AM

Testimony:
I support Bill 57 very strongly and offer a couple of amendments to add more safety for our public.

- "Sensitive Places" needs to include the shelters, correctional systems, and at- risk programs for ADULTs. Mental illness, drug addiction, violent tendencies are prevalent in those adult situations. Currently the bill only states "juvenile" justice and at-risk programs.
- Clearly seen/displayed signage must be required at the front of all establishments that retain a right to allow firearms on their property. The public must clearly know that firearms are allowed in that place so individuals can decide whether to enter or not.

Thank you.

Name: Audrey Lister	Email: eirelister9@gmail.com	Zip: 96826
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 03:29 AM

Testimony:
Allowing citizens to legally carry firearms of a certain caliber on them for protection only makes sense. The criminals are the ones demonstrating gun violence; not law-abiding citizens. But it may prevent criminal violence if the criminal encounters opposition in the way of a firearm. Criminals will acquire guns either way— laws don't prevent them from crime. Especially lax laws. But citizens enable to defend themselves WILL prevent crime.

Name: james wallace	Email: diehd49@yahoo.com	Zip: 96792
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 04:27 AM

Testimony:
I am 100% oppose Bill57.Why does criminals get the upper hand when it comes to guns?Law abiding citizens who goes thru back ground check always is limited and suppressed of there right to bear arms.If Bill 57 passes the criminals will be celebrating with the anti-2nd ammendment activates.They will never listing to the laws I promise you.

Name: Pa'akaula Kalawai'anui	Email: PKNAKOA@GMAIL.COM	Zip: 96743
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 04:59 AM

Testimony:

As someone who has experienced gun violence FIRST HAND, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this bill.

Criminals do not follow laws, and defining sensitive places to the extent where legal and licensed firearm owners are effectively NOT allowed to carry their self defense tool during their daily lives will not improve public safety, only limit legal law abiding gun owners, who have already gone through a lengthy application process to obtain a license.

Not only is this an infringement upon our constitutional rights, but it also, as stated above, does nothing to improve public safety, only limit ability of law abiding and licensed individuals to protect themselves, and once again give a pass to criminals who already are breaking the law.

Name: Joan Naka	Email: dojohawaii@gmail.com	Zip: 96825
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 05:37 AM

Testimony:

Must strengthen gun safety laws

Name: Ryan Tanaka	Email: ryan@ibmhawaii.com	Zip: 96821
Representing: Hawaii Restaurant Association	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 06:14 AM

Name: Joe Battista	Email: ditchhanger@aol.com	Zip: 96789
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 06:46 AM

Testimony:

Although I believe that there should be regulations for carrying firearms in public, I also believe that our already stringent gun laws in Hawaii are written as blanket laws. The way HB57 is written, it outlaws carrying a firearm basically everywhere. I understand that I'm hospitals, government offices and schools it is important to be controlled, but these laws you write are ridiculous. I oppose this bill as it is written

Name: Lois Langham	Email: llangham7@gmail.com	Zip: 96814
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 08:06 AM

Testimony:

I support this and any measure that would make the Aloha State a Safe State. Guns don't make us safe and the thought of more people and situations where there are guns makes me feel unsafe.

Name: Nancy Marker	Email: nmarker@hawaii.edu	Zip: 96826
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 08:20 AM

Testimony:

Dear Councilmembers:

I support Bill 57 which will be address our public health and safety by providing for sensitive areas where firearms may not be carried by private individuals. I am pleased that it includes the "default" provision as well as the list of other "sensitive places"

where guns cannot be carried.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nancy Marker

Name: Nathan Soriano	Email: natesoriano@outlook.com	Zip: 96818
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 08:46 AM

Testimony:

Just like to say, you limiting law, abiding citizens is against the constitution. Criminals like having places where they can go where they're the only ones with guns. I feel you should hold some responsibilities if any crimes are committed with guns against law abiding citizens either payment with funerals or medical bills, the council should be responsible for some of that cost, most of the crimes that are committed or in those sanctuaries spots that you want to declare stop infringing on the rights of law abiding to citizens put harsher penalties for criminals not the citizens. Thank you.

Name: Rechung Fujihira	Email: info@theboxjelly.com	Zip: 96816
Representing: Self	Position: Support	Submitted: Feb 22, 2023 @ 09:34 AM



Testimony of Ramya Swami, State Policy Manager
Support for Bill 57
Before the Honolulu City Council

February 22nd, 2023

Dear Chair Waters, Vice-Chair Kia'Āina and Distinguished Members of the Honolulu City Council,

Founded in 1974, Brady works across Congress, courts, and communities, uniting gun owners and non-gun owners alike, to take action, not sides, and end America's gun violence epidemic. Brady today carries the name of Jim Brady, who was shot and severely injured in the assassination attempt on President Ronald Reagan. Jim and his wife, Sarah, led the fight to pass federal legislation requiring background checks for gun sales. Brady continues to uphold Jim and Sarah's legacy by uniting Americans from coast to coast, red and blue, young and old, liberal and conservative, to combat the epidemic of gun violence. **In furtherance of our goal to reduce firearm violence across Honolulu, the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence is proud to support the passage of Bill 57.**

Honolulu leaders have persisted in prioritizing the safety and well-being of the people of Honolulu by enacting and implementing proactive, research-informed policy solutions that prevent gun violence, save lives, and spare entire communities from loss, trauma and cycles of violence. However, Honolulu County is home to just under 70% of the population of the entire State of Hawaii.¹ On average, over 50 percent of people killed by gun violence in Hawaii are killed in Honolulu County.² One firearm death is one too many and Honolulu can do more—like pass Bill 57 to ensure safety of its citizens.

¹ United States Census Bureau, *QuickFacts*, <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045222>

² On average, 55 people in Hawaii are killed by gun violence each year and an average of 30 of those deaths occur in Honolulu County. *See*; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), *WISQARS Injury Data*, <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/index.html>; *See also*: County Health Rankings and Road Maps, University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, *Firearm Fatalities in Hawaii*, <https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/app/hawaii/2022/measure/factors/148/data>.

Why This Bill is Needed

Since the release of the *Bruen* decision, over 500 people in Hawaii have reportedly applied for concealed carry permits, with 436 applications pending in Oahu as of September 2022.³ If these applications are granted, it increases the number of people who will be able to carry firearms in public spaces. We cannot guarantee that the State will have a robust response to the *Bruen* decision or when it would go into effect. Until that happens, it is imperative that Honolulu County acts to protect the constituents and visitors who have a right to feel safe from the threat of gun violence when in public. This right extends beyond just City Hall and voting centers but also to preschools and childcare facilities, all forms of public transportation, hospitals and care facilities, establishments that sell liquor, public event spaces, playgrounds, parks and athletic areas open to the public and more.

The Supreme Court in *Bruen* left it up to State and local legislatures to restrict the use of firearms in certain “sensitive places,” including schools and government buildings. Bill 57 is consistent with SCOTUS case law, and continues to make Honolulu County one of the safest in the country by ensuring that the County broadens its sensitive place restrictions.

What The Bill Does

Bill 57 outlines “sensitive places” where firearms cannot be carried including child care facilities and places frequented by children, city-owned buildings or offices, all forms of public transportation (except as provided for by State or federal law), voter service centers, and first amendment expressive spaces.

These essential safety measures will pass constitutional muster. The Supreme Court in *Bruen* made it clear that its holding was “neither a regulatory straightjacket nor a regulatory blank check,” and that restrictions on guns in sensitive places are still permissible, so long as they are objective.

Within this legislation, each sensitive place has been evaluated in terms of their individual characteristics. The nature of the activities taking place in each of these locations as well as the presence of certain vulnerable populations warrant each location’s classification as a sensitive place. It would be illogical to deem a swath of locations “not sensitive,” simply because the list seems too long. These are all areas where it will only benefit the health and safety of Honolulu County citizens to restrict the concealed carrying of firearms.

³ *Maui leads in gun-carry permits; other counties to follow soon*. KHON2.com. (2022, September 23). Retrieved November 22, 2022 from <https://www.khon2.com/always-investigating/maui-leads-in-gun-carry-permits-other-counties-expect-to-issue-soon/>

Bill 57 is a common-sense and constitutional response to the *Bruen* decision and will help protect constituents and visitors in Honolulu County by ensuring that those carrying firearms are unable to intimidate them with the threat of deadly force in these public, sensitive spaces.

Conclusion

The provisions of Bill 57 are consistent with *Bruen*, pass constitutional muster, and would ensure that Honolulu County protects its citizens from the threat of senseless firearm violence in places of peace. This bill does just that and for these reasons, Brady urges you to support Bill 57.

Sincerely,

Ramya Swami
State Policy Manager
The Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence



**TESTIMONY OF TINA YAMAKI, PRESIDENT
RETAIL MERCHANTS OF HAWAII**

February 22, 2023

Re: Bill 57 CD1 (2022) RELATING TO THE PUBLIC CARRY OF FIREARMS.

Good morning, Chair Waters and members of the Honolulu City Council. I am Tina Yamaki, President of the Retail Merchants of Hawaii and I appreciate this opportunity to testify.

The Retail Merchants of Hawaii was founded in 1901 and is a statewide, not for profit trade organization committed to supporting the growth and development of the retail industry in Hawaii. Our membership includes small mom & pop stores, large box stores, resellers, luxury retail, department stores, shopping malls, on-line sellers, local, national, and international retailers, chains, and everyone in between.

We are in strong support of Bill 57 CD1 (2022) Relating to The Public Carry of Firearms. This measure defines those sensitive locations within the City and County of Honolulu where the carrying of firearms is prohibited, consistent with an individual's Second Amendment right to bear arms and the United States Supreme Court's ruling in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen*, 142 S. Ct. 2111 (2022).

We appreciate that RETAIL is clearly defined in this ordinance as a business establishment. This measure makes it clear that the public carrying concealed firearms is not allowed at retail locations. This way, retailers would not have to purchase numerous special signage to disallow guns in their establishments and confront customers who may think they are entitled. We have seen this happen recently during the pandemic when face masks were mandated. The push back, verbal and sometimes physical abuse from those who did not want to wear the mandatory masks were horrendous. With conceal to carry, we especially don't want our employees to be confronted with a firearm if someone is denied entry or service.

On a daily basis, retailers continue to be hard hit by thieves who shoplift and try to fight back with employees or good Samaritans when confronted. Shoplifters are becoming more aggressive when fighting back. Our major concern is that there is someone who wants to be "the hero" and tries to shoot the shoplifter, misses and a customer or employee is injured, or the shoplifter tries to shoot his way out of being caught. **We want our customers and employees to feel safe to come to work and shop in our stores. Without shoppers there would be no retail brick and mortar stores and if retail stores close due to lack of customers, there will be less people working.**

We would like to point out that on any given day there are large public gathering of shoppers at retail stores and shopping malls. Malls and retail locations attract large number of people who are there to shop.

Active shooters are prevalent in malls across the United States. In 2022 alone, there were active shooter incidents in malls that include but not limited to Mall of America, Westfield Garden State Plaza, Beverly Hill Center, Greenwood Park Mall, Columbia Mall, Inland Center Mall, Stanford's Shopping Center, Atlantic Station mall, Scottsdale Fashion Square Shopping mall, Eastridge Mall, Ellenton Premium Outlets, Tysons Corner Center, Stanford Shopping Center, Inland Shopping Center, Macomb Mall, Jefferson Mall, Kings Plaza Shopping Center, and the Irving Mall. And while these malls are on the mainland and not in Hawaii, our state must remain vigilant and not think "It won't happen here." Again, **we don't want someone to think they are going to be "the Hero" or go viral on social media for trying to take down an active shooter and then shooting a customer or employee instead.** Not everyone who has a conceal and carry permit will be a weapon's expert. It is our understanding that at a firing range is very different than put in a live situation. In a live situation, most people's adrenaline is heightened, reactions are instantaneous, and mistakes can be made. **Unlike video games, there is no reset or do over when someone gets shot.**

We want to ensure that our employees and customers feel safe working and shopping in our stores.

Mahalo again for this opportunity to testify.

Aloha,

I strongly OPPOSE Bill 57. As I sit here and write this I am in disbelief at the level of animosity expressed in this bill toward lawful gun owners. This bill will do nothing to increase public safety, and I am confident it was never meant to.

Instead it makes an effort to punish those lawful citizens who want to express their right to defend themselves and their loved ones with a firearm both inside and outside their home. As the fourth person to receive my concealed carry license here in Honolulu County I can tell you the proposed sensitive places put forward in this bill will make it impossible for me to carry almost anywhere on Oahu. Indeed, the places that this bill would make off limits to legal concealed carry are the very places where I would expect needing to defend myself using my firearm. Let's face it- criminals will not obey this bill if it turned into law. Saying this is almost a cliché at this point but it is nonetheless true.

Case in point - a few weeks ago a young mother and her 6month old infant were brutally run down by a man in a car, who then began beating the woman to death with a tire iron. One good Samaritan tried to stop the attacker but was also beaten brutally. The delay in concealed carry permits over the past six months has prevented hundreds of people from getting their concealed carry license. If the Chief of Police had simply issued permits under the existing rules it is possible an onlooker may have been able to stop the attacker by presenting their legally carried firearm - and hopefully the attacker would have stopped without a shot being fired. Sadly, this was not the case and if this bill is passed into law it will strip the ability of all concealed carriers from legally carrying concealed into Walmart or any other store, park, bank, bus, or rail. Here's the real point - IT WILL NOT STOP THE MURDERERS, RAPISTS, MUGGERS, or other violent criminals.

You will assuredly hear the people in favor of this bill say they do not want to have shoplifters being attacked in their stores by concealed carriers- do not fall for this logical fallacy - for the theft of property does not meet the threshold where deadly force is lawful. All gun owners know this. Also, do not fall for the fallacy that they do not want their employees from having to ask a person carrying a firearm concealed to leave - a concealed firearm literally means no one knows you are carrying it.

I urge you to OPPOSE Bill 57. Mahalo for your consideration.

Jon Abbott



North Shore Ko'olau Diversity Collective

To: Committee on Executive Matter and Legal Affairs, Honolulu City Council

Hearing Date: Friday, February 17, 2023

Re: Testimony in Support of Bill 57 (2022), CD1

From: Joe Wilson, North Shore Ko'olau Diversity Collective

Dear Chair Dos Santos-Tam, Vice Chair Cordero and members of the committee

I write on behalf of the North Shore Ko'olau Diversity Collective in STRONG SUPPORT of Bill 57 (2022), CD1, to define those sensitive locations within the City and County of Honolulu where the carrying of firearms is prohibited, consistent with the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen*, 142 S. Ct. 2111 (2022).

As a grassroots effort working to ensure that our rural O'ahu communities are welcoming, inclusive, and supportive of m̄hū and LGBTQ+ individuals, families, and allies, personal and public safety are paramount, particularly amidst new waves of homophobic and transphobic activism in the islands.

We appreciate and support any and all efforts by City Council to ensure that as many public and private spaces as possible remain free of guns and firearms that allow antagonizers to do harm.

[Organizing Committee](#)

Joe Wilson – Elizabeth J. Rago – Michelle Johnson Blimes – Kunane Dreier – Bethany Berry-Weiss – Hao Le

Chapter 15 of the Rules of the Chief of Police, HPD, entitled “Firearms Permits and Licenses.”

I am writing to submit written testimony for less restrictions for qualified civilians to carry firearms concealed and non-concealed (open carry).

Please be sure that the Special Places limitations does not apply to retired law enforcement.

The proposed bans from carrying in locations such as schools, government buildings, parks, voting locations, public transportation, private businesses, banks, and medical establishments in effect is a “back door ban” and portrays the corruption of the public officials making these restrictions. You use your authority to violate our Constitutional Rights.

Qualified citizens cannot get buy food, eat at a restaurant, get medical attention, cannot withdraw or deposit money at their bank. Basically, the above-restrictions only allows carrying while driving or walking on public streets. Furthermore, public officials do not have the authority to restrict what private property owners allow on their property.

I have been employed as a federal Special Agent working as a federal law enforcement agent/officer for the past 18 years. My wife would be passing the same background database checks as me. Yet your “back door ban” treats my wife as a criminal, who has no constitutional right to carry a firearm for self-defense.

Qualified citizens should be able to carry both open and concealed. .Open carry can serves as an effective deterrent to crime.

I also support qualified citizens to carry high capacity magazines. This will allow the qualified citizen to defend themselves on a more even playing field, when defending against violent criminal attackers who are well-known to disobey firearms laws.

On another note, you could add restrictions like the same prohibitions to driving under the influence of alcohol as with carrying a firearm. You could also require citizens to report that they are legally carrying a firearm, if the are encountered by law enforcement. You could also have lock boxes at the sensitive areas where we could lock up our firearms before entering.

Rory K. Fujimoto, S/A, 10/3/2022

last four of social security number 7680

Chapter 15 of the Rules of the Chief of Police, HPD, entitled “Firearms Permits and Licenses.”

Hi, my name is Lori Fujimoto. I am here today to speak in support of less restrictions for qualified civilians to carry firearms concealed and non-concealed (open carry).

The proposed ban prohibits qualified citizens from carrying in locations such as schools, government buildings, parks, voting locations, public transportation, private businesses, banks, and medical establishments in effect is a “back door ban” or “disguised ban” that violates our Constitutional Rights. Qualified citizens cannot buy food, eat at a restaurant, get medical attention, cannot withdraw or deposit money at their bank. It is so restrictive that it basically only allows carrying while driving to “nowhere” or walking on public streets going again to “nowhere”.

My husband has been employed as a federal Special Agent, working as a federal law enforcement agent/officer for the past 18 years. I, as his wife, would pass the same background database checks as him. Yet your “back door ban” treats me as a criminal, who has no constitutional right to carry a firearm for self-defense.

The sensitive area laminations should not apply to retired law enforcement.

Qualified citizens should be able to carry both open and concealed. Open carry serves as an effective deterrent to violent crime.

Integrity demands that you public officials abide by the US Constitution and what was specified by the US Supreme Court, and not circumvent or suppress the law with your own political bias. The restrictions are an indirect attack on the law-abiding citizens of the State of Hawaii.

I also support qualified citizens to carry high capacity magazines. This will allow the qualified citizen to defend themselves on a more even playing field, when defending against violent criminal attackers who are well-known to disobey firearms laws like the laws restricting magazine capacity.

On another note, you could add restrictions like the same prohibitions to driving under the influence of alcohol as with carrying a firearm. And you could also require citizens to report that they are legally carrying a firearm, if they are encountered by law enforcement.

Lori K. Fujimoto, 10/3/2022
last four of social security number 7284

TESTIMONY OF ELLEN GODBEY CARSON IN SUPPORT OF Bill 57

I write in strong support of Bill 57, with a request for amendments to strengthen the bill.

While I write as an individual, I have served as president of the Hawaii State Bar Association, the Institute for Human Services (IHS) and Hale Kipa Youth Services. In these capacities, I have strived to strike the right balance for safety of our community and protection of individual rights.

I support Bill 57 because it creates numerous measures to better protect our community, while complying the US Supreme Court's mandate that public carry permits be allowed.

I request the following amendments to help better safeguard our community:

A. Expand "Sensitive places" for at-risk populations beyond those included in section (c)(3), which only includes shelters and at-risk programs serving children. The bill should include adult homeless shelters and programs serving adults involved in our corrections system and similar at-risk adults. Adults are much more likely to be carrying firearms, in the first place. Most importantly, many of the persons served by these adult programs experience mental illness and/or substance abuse addiction where any presence of a firearm creates an unreasonable and imminent threat of deadly harm.

B. In section 40-__4(a), certain owners of property are permitted to provide express consent for carrying of firearms on their property, stating "Express consent may include signage." I request amendments so as to require a "clear and conspicuous posting" if any of those property owners want to allow carrying of firearms on their properties. This is the only fair way to provide notice to all persons who may otherwise wish to enter or patronize those locations, that firearms may be present on the property. This will allow us all to make our own reasonable choices for self-protection. Thus, the operative phrase should require that the owner "provide express consent and clearly and conspicuously post a sign at all public entrances to the building or premises indicating that license holders are permitted to carry firearms on the property."

Thank you for your consideration of my testimony and helping protect our most vulnerable residents.

Ellen Godbey Carson
Honolulu, Hawaii



**Church
of the
Crossroads**
United Church of Christ



A Just Peace and Open and Affirming Congregation

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF BILL 57, WITH REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS

The Church of the Crossroads celebrates 100 years of being Hawaii's first intentionally multiethnic church, dedicated to missions that include peace, justice, and stewardship of the environment.

In January 2023, our church congregation voted unanimously to advocate for stronger gun safety measures, including requiring thorough background checks of criminal and mental health history, robust safety training for all firearms permits, transfers and licenses, and prohibiting firearms from Sensitive Places, “broadly defined to include but not be limited to government al buildings, parks, public transportation, sports and entertainment venues, bars and restaurants, commercial establishments, schools and homeless shelters.”

The Church of the Crossroads supports Bill 57, with a request for amendments to strengthen the bill. We support Bill 57 because it creates numerous measures to better protect our community, while complying the unfortunate US Supreme Court’s mandate that public carry permits be allowed. **We request the following amendments to more effectively meet our community’s safety needs:**

A. Expand “Sensitive places” for at-risk populations beyond those included in section (c)(3), which only includes shelters and at-risk programs serving children. The bill should also include adult homeless shelters, programs serving adults involved in our corrections system and similar at-risk adults. Adults are much more likely to be carrying firearms, in the first place. Most importantly, many of the persons served by these adult programs experience mental illness and/or substance abuse addiction where any presence of a firearm creates an unreasonable and imminent threat of deadly harm.

B. In section 40-__4(a), certain owners of property are permitted to provide express consent for carrying of firearms on their property, stating “Express consent may include signage.” We request amendments so as to require a “clear and conspicuous posting” if any of those property owners want to allow carrying of firearms on their properties. This is the only fair way to provide notice to all persons who may otherwise wish to enter or patronize those locations, that firearms may be present on the property. This will allow us all to make our own reasonable choices for self-protection. Thus, the operative phrase should require that the owner “provide express consent and clearly and conspicuously post a sign at all public entrances to the building or premises indicating that license holders are permitted to carry firearms on the property.”

Thank you for consideration of our testimony and helping protect the safety of our community.

Submitted by Ellen Godbey Carson on behalf of the Church of the Crossroads email:
office@churchofthecrossroadshawaii.org

BILL057 (22)

Dear City Council,

Please do not pass this restriction on the carrying of firearms by the public.

These restrictions excessively burden the public who have a right to self-defense from having access to their tools where ever they may face a dangerous confrontation. Why do you feel it necessary to limit the public's ability to defend themselves when the aggressors, criminals, have no such limitations? Criminals can do anything but we the public have limitations? Who are you protecting with these ordinances anyway?

Perhaps you should read the 2nd Amendment and the 14th Amendments before you jump to the wrong conclusions regarding the rights of the People who you are violating.

Why spend the taxpayer's time and money defending laws that are clearly against the U.S Constitution or even passing these ordinances in the first place? Everyone has the right to self-defense not just the criminals who brake the laws and seem to have access to firearms with few consequences. The police do not have the responsibility to ensure the safety of the individual citizens and most of us can't afford private armed guards. Most of us have a difficult time affording our basic daily needs.

We must carry the most effective tool for self-defense that we can obtain with our limited financial abilities. The current rules in place for the concealed carrying of a firearm are very burdensome for the public. Each individual, tax payers who pay for everything, deserve the ability to exercise the rights guaranteed by our creator and codified in the U.S. Constitution. I don't understand why you believe it necessary to turn our rights into privileges with this proposal. Do not pass this bill.

Indivisible Hawaii supports Bill 57 (2022), CD1

BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS

Section 40.____.2 Definitions

Carry on their Person amended to clarify includes concealed and unconcealed, and expand “receptacles”

School expanded to include nursery schools

Sensitive Place

(3)(A) expanded to include school busses and bus stops

(3)(B) expanded to include playgrounds and recreational grounds or centers

(4) expanded to include vote counting centers and places where ballots are stored

(7) to add public gatherings

(8) to add medical facilities

(9) to add Waikiki

(10) to add places of worship/religious observation

(11) to add adult shelters

(12) to add libraries

(13) to specify that Sensitive Places includes buildings and parts thereof, associated grounds, walkways, and parking areas, and to provide exemption for licensed persons loading and unloading guns from their vehicle in a sensitive parking lot

40-____3 prohibition against the public carrying of firearms in Sensitive Places

(a) to add “possess”, to specify “loaded or unloaded”, and “operable or inoperable”

(b)(3) exception for police stations

(b)(4) exception for evidence in courtrooms

(c)(1) to add confiscation, revocation and disqualification to penalty

40-____4 prohibition against the public carry of firearms on private Businesses’ or Charitable Establishments’ premises without express consent

(a) to add private property owned by another

(b) to add private property owned by another, and remove exclusion of privately owned or maintained Streets or

Sidewalks

(c) to clarify that the exceptions apply only to private property that is a Business Establishment or Charitable Establishment

(d)(1) to add confiscation, revocation, and disqualification to penalty

40-____.5 Prohibition against the public carry of a Pistol or Revolver without possession of License to carry

(c)(1) to add confiscation, revocation, and disqualification to penalty

blue = comments

Red = suggestions

... = TEXT THAT HAS NOT BEEN AMENDED AND THAT HAS BEEN OMITTED IN THE INTEREST OF BREVITY

BILL 57 (2022)

A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE

RELATING TO THE PUBLIC CARRY OF FIREARMS.

BE IT ORDAINED by the People of the City and County of Honolulu:

SECTION 1. Purpose. . . .

SECTION 2 . . .

“Article ____: Public Carry of Firearms

Sec. 40.____.1 Declaration of legislative intent. . . .

Sec. 40.____.2 Definitions.

For the purposes of this article, the following definitions apply unless the context clearly indicates or requires a different meaning.

Business . . .

Business Establishment . . .

Carry on their Person. The person has immediate physical access to the firearm, such as carrying the firearm, concealed or unconcealed, in a holster, pocket, bag, backpack, or other receptacle.

Charitable Establishment . . .

Child or Minor . . .

Child Care . . .

Child Care Facility . . .

Detective, Private Detective, and Investigator . . .

Dwelling Unit . . .

Firearm(s) . . .

Guard . . .

License . . .

Lodging Unit . . .

Operating Hours . . .

Pistol or Revolver . . .

Place of Deposit . . .

Public Park . . .

Public Place . . .

School. Includes all institutions that provide preschool, nursery school, elementary, secondary, post-secondary, technical, or trade or vocational education, including youth challenge academies, and includes all athletic facilities, offices, cafeterias and eating establishments, health care facilities, research facilities, parking lots, and shared rooms and common areas of dormitories thereof. "School" does not include a private residence at which education is provided for children who are all related to one another by blood, marriage, or adoption.

Sensitive Place. Within the city:

(1)

(2)

(3) Schools, Child Care Facilities, and places frequented by children, as follows:

In, or on (A) the grounds of, any public school, parochial school, private school, or Child Care center [should this be Child Care Facility?], including associated busses and bus stops.

All Public (B) Parks, playgrounds, and recreational grounds or centers, during each park's Operating Hours, excluding the Koko Head Shooting Complex.

(C) . . .

(D) . . .

~~(4)~~ Voter Service Center, Place of Deposit, and its Appurtenances, as designated by election officials pursuant to HRS Section §11-132, and vote counting centers and places where ballots are stored; each of these including ~~and~~ an area of 200 feet from the perimeter of each location; ~~of any Voter Service Center, Place of Deposit, and its Appurtenances, as designated by election officials pursuant to HRS Section §11-132;~~ as follows:

- (A) As applied to Voter Service Centers and their Appurtenances, all Operating Hours, as set forth in HRS §11-109; and
- (B) As applied to a Place of Deposit, vote counting center, places where ballots are stored, and ~~its~~ their Appurtenances, all times at which these ~~Place of Deposit is~~ are accessible to the public.

(5).

~~(6)~~ First Amendment expressive activities: within a distance of 100 200 feet of the outer edge of any group of 25 or more people, in a Public Place, who are engaged in expressive activities involving speech or conduct, the principal object of which is the expression, dissemination, or communication by verbal, visual, literary, or auditory means of political, religious, philosophical, or ideological opinions, views, or ideas.

~~(7)~~ public gathering or special event conducted on property open to the public that requires the issuance of a permit from a federal, state, or local government and the Sidewalk or Street immediately adjacent to the public gathering or special event and within 200 feet ~~from perimeter of the~~ event or gathering; provided that there are signs clearly and conspicuously posted at visible places along the perimeter of the event; and further provided that a person with a valid License to carry a Firearm is permitted to walk through the property solely to the extent and for the time necessary to access the individual's residence, place of business, or vehicle; that this exception does not allow the individual to loiter or remain in the sensitive place longer than necessary to complete their travel.

~~(8)~~ public or private hospitals or hospital affiliates, medical facilities, mental health facilities, nursing homes, clinics, medical offices, urgent care facilities, or other places at which medical or health services are customarily provided.

~~(9)~~ any area within Waikiki as defined in Section 712-1207.

~~(10)~~ places of worship or religious observation.

~~(11)~~ shelters and residential facilities operated by a government entity; adult foster homes as defined in HRS Section 321-11.2; developmental disabilities apartment complexes and development disabilities domiciliary homes, as defined in HRS Section 321-15.9; behavioral health crises centers, community mental health centers, psychiatric facilities, and special treatment facilities, as defined in HRS Section 334.1; emergency shelters, homeless facilities, and transitional shelters, as defined in HRS Section 346-361; shelters

as defined in HRS Section 127A-19, and family shelters, shelters for adults, domestic violence shelters, or residential programs for victims of domestic abuse.

~~(1b)~~aries

~~(1c)~~sitive Places includes any building or part thereof, any associated grounds, any walkway, and any parking space or facility, in each case owned or controlled by the designated entity. A person licensed to carry a Firearm under Section 134-9 or in accordance with Title 18 U.S.C. Section 926B or 926C may have the licensed Firearm in the immediate area surrounding the person's vehicle within a Sensitive Places parking area for the limited purpose of storing or retrieving the Firearm.

Sidewalk . . .

Street . . .

Voter Service Center . . .

Voter Service Center, Place of Deposit, and its Appurtenances . . .

Sec. 40-___ .3 Prohibition against the public carrying of Firearms in Sensitive Places.

- (a) *Prohibition.* Except as otherwise provided by federal or State law, it is a violation of this article for any person to intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly possess or Carry on their Person a Firearm, loaded or unloaded, concealed or unconcealed, operable or inoperable, in any sensitive place.
- (b) *Exceptions.* This prohibition shall not apply to:
 - (1) . . .
 - (2) Detectives, Private Detectives, Investigators, and Guards, authorized by the Chief of Police to carry a Firearm in a particular sensitive place, while on duty in that sensitive place.
 - (3) Persons possessing or carrying an unloaded Firearm in a police station in accordance with HRS Sections 134-23(a)(6), 134-24(a)(6), or 134-25(a)(6).
 - (4) A person possessing or carrying an unloaded Firearm in a courthouse for evidentiary purposes with the prior express authorization of the court.
- (c) *Criminal penalties; enforcement.*
 - (1) Any person violating this section is guilty of a misdemeanor, shall have all Firearms in their possession confiscated, shall have any License to carry Firearms revoked, and be disqualified from obtaining a new License to carry any Firearm, concealed or unconcealed.
 - (2) . . .

- (3) . . .
- (4) The presence of a person at any sensitive place in subsection (a) shall be prima facie evidence that the person knows it is a Sensitive Place.

Sec. 40-____.4 Prohibition against the public carry of Firearms on private Businesses' or Charitable Establishments' premises without express consent.

- (a) *Prohibition.* Except as otherwise provided by federal or State law, it is a violation of this article for any person to intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly Carry on their Person a Firearm, concealed or unconcealed, on the premises of any private property owned by another, including any Business Establishment or Charitable Establishment unless the owner of the private property owned by another, Business Establishment or Charitable Establishment, or an agent thereof, has expressly consented thereto. Express consent ~~may shall be in the form of include~~ signage.
- (b) For purposes of this section, “the premises of any private property owned by another or Business Establishment or Charitable Establishment” includes all appurtenant grounds and parking lots of the private property or Business Establishment or Charitable Establishment, but does not include privately owned or maintained streets or sidewalks.
- (c) *Exceptions.* With respect to Business Establishments and Charitable Establishments, Tthis prohibition shall not apply to:
 - (1) . . .
 - (2) Detectives, Private Detectives, Investigators, and Guards, authorized by the Chief of Police to carry a Firearm in a particular Sensitive Place, while on duty in that Sensitive Place.
- (d) *Criminal penalties; enforcement.*
 - (1) Any person violating this section is guilty of a misdemeanor, ~~shall have all Firearms in their possession confiscated, shall have~~ any License to carry Firearms revoked, and be disqualified from obtaining a new License to carry any Firearm, concealed or unconcealed.
 - (2) . . .
 - (3) . . .
 - (4) The presence of a person on the premises of any Business Establishment or Charitable Establishment shall be prima facie evidence that the person knows it is the premises of a Business Establishment or Charitable Establishment.

Sec. 40-____.5 Prohibition against the public carry of a Pistol or Revolver without possession of License

to carry.

(a) ...

(b) ...

(c) *Criminal penalties; enforcement.*

(1) Any person violating this section is guilty of a misdemeanor, shall have all Firearms in their possession confiscated, shall have any License to carry Firearms revoked, and be disqualified from obtaining a new License to carry any Firearm, concealed or unconcealed.

...

Sec. 40-____.6 Severability.

...

SECTION 3. ...

Monday February 20, 2023

IN SUPPORT OF Bill 057(22)

Hi, my name is Rachel Logan and I'm a volunteer with the Hawaii chapter Moms Demand Action. We are not an anti-second amendment group, we support common sense gun legislation. I believe in the 2nd Amendment right to bear arms, but I do not believe that guns are appropriate everywhere in our modern society. I do not wish to take someone's handguns away – I support common sense gun laws. Without this bill, we are expected to trust total strangers to be armed "silent protectors" throughout our community – that is a **very** big ask. Guns don't make everyone feel safe. Firearms make me feel anxious, not safe. Hawaii has been one of the safest states for gun violence for decades and we need to preserve that. I don't have to tell you that this isn't the mainland and we don't want it to be. Putting guns out into our community, as we go about our daily lives, will increase the risk of injury and violence, just by their presence because they will now be part of the equation. It is my fear that the accidents and escalations will outnumber the heroics. This is a really big deal, because our community can be pretty hotheaded at times. To go from moving freely through my community without having to think about guns, to now having to review a list and weigh the possibilities because hundreds of gun permits are waiting in the wings. Hundreds of armed silent protectors. That is a huge culture shift in our community, and we should be cautious and anticipate ramifications.

Military bases do not allow conceal carry and the nation's highest-ranking military officer has said he doesn't think soldiers should carry concealed weapons on base. This gives me pause and I think it should for you as well. If the United States military doesn't think concealed carry is wise, even in a heavily controlled area such as a base, why do we think the general public are qualified for unfettered access throughout our community to carry guns? If we want people to act with firearm common sense, we have to set the precedent by passing common sense gun legislation.

The law has changed and we must respect the law. If we must have concealed weapons in our community, there should be some limits, but not just federal buildings. Guns don't belong in schools and parks and other places that children play. Guns should not be allowed where alcohol is sold and consumed. When I am taking my young children to the grocery store, the playground, or the beach, I do not want to have to worry about the presence of guns. It is complicated when it comes to protecting your family and we all have the right to do so, but we are going to have to find a compromise because firearms don't make everyone feel safe. We should have access to areas where we can take our families if we're concerned about the potential presence of concealed guns - and businesses should have to openly post out front if firearms are allowed on their property.

I strongly support Bill 057(22) and am very grateful to our local leaders in Honolulu who

understand the importance of keeping guns out of places where the risk of harm is particularly high. Please pass this bill so we can continue to feel safe to move throughout our community freely and provide our children the safe spaces they deserve in order to thrive.

Mahalo,

Rachel Logan

Concerned Parent & Citizen

Events Lead - Moms Demand Action - Hawaii Chapter

I am writing to ask that, when the time comes, you vote to oppose Bill 57, which virtually establishes the whole city as a “sensitive place” where our right to be armed defensively under the U.S. Constitution is severely restricted.

The Supreme Court of the U.S. has spoken with the Bruen Decision and Bill 57 is nothing more than an end run around their ruling because a few folks in leadership don’t believe in it.

Bill 57 is nothing more than an attempt to retain the status quo ante where no law abiding citizen was allowed to carry a firearm in public. Permits were simply not issued.

While I believe that some training in the use of firearms and Hawaii laws is reasonable, I feel the new rules of the Police chief are onerous and set up to discourage those who would need or like to exercise their rights under the Constitution. One should not have to ask permission. Again an end run around the SCOTUS ruling that will surely be challenged.

Remember, the Constitution is not to be Cherry picked.

I urge you to vote, NO on this ordinance.

The issuance of a Legal Permit to Carry would make most of these items Null and Void

I have copy pasted sections of the ordinance to be reviewed, with **my comments** below them.



CITY COUNCIL
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
HONOLULU, HAWAII

ORDINANCE _____

BILL 57 (2022), CD1

A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE

SECTION 1. Purpose.

The purpose of this ordinance is to DEFINE those sensitive locations within the City and County of Honolulu ("City") where the carrying of firearms is prohibited.

The descriptions of 41-__2 Definitions is clear, but the use of the "is prohibited" should be changed to "may be/could be/shall be". The decision ultimately lies with the private property owner. It will not be all inclusive.

It is the further purpose of this ordinance to PROTECT sensitive areas that have traditionally been subject to restrictions on carrying or possessing arms therein.

This is just an ordinance – There is NO PROTECTION being provided.

It is the further purpose of this ordinance to FACILITATE COMMUNICATION to the public of decisions by private businesses and charitable establishments in permitting or restricting firearms on their property.

I think this is meant to help people understand that there are Federal Laws, State Laws and then City ordinances, in that order of Hierarchy and that private property owners have their own decision to make

SECTION 2. Chapter 41, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 2021

41-__2 Definitions.

Sensitive Place. Within the city:

(1) All areas within or on city-owned or -controlled buildings or offices, excluding:

All good here, City should be allowed to designate city buildings.

(2) Except as otherwise provided by federal or State law, all areas within or on buildings or offices owned or controlled by the United States or the State.

Federal and State Laws will supersede City ordinances. Individuals must have a Legally Issued Permit to Carry

(5) Public transportation facilities, except as provided by federal or State law, as follows:

Federal and State Laws will supersede City ordinances. Individuals must have a Legally Issued Permit to Carry



CITY COUNCIL
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
HONOLULU, HAWAII

ORDINANCE _____

BILL 57 (2022), CD1

A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE

41-__3 Prohibition against the public carrying of firearms in sensitive places.

(a) Prohibition. Except as otherwise provided by Federal or State law.

Federal and State Laws will supersede City ordinances. Individuals must have a Legally Issued Permit to Carry

(b) Exceptions. This prohibition does not apply to:

(1) Persons exempted from HRS § 134-9 pursuant to HRS § 134-11;

For Individuals that have been issued a Legal permit to carry, the ordinance does not apply

https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/vol03_ch0121-0200d/hrs0134/hrs_0134-0009.htm

§134-9 Licenses to carry.

(c) No person shall carry concealed or unconcealed on the person a pistol or revolver without being licensed to do so under this section or in compliance with sections 134-5(c) or 134-25.

Under State Laws, Individuals can be issued a Permit to Carry.

The permitting process to obtain a Permit to Carry is very detailed and precise.

I urge you to vote, NO on this ordinance.

Thank You for your review of my written testimony.

Jason Moore
Ohua Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii

TO: CITY COUNCIL, CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

RE: BILL 57: RELATING TO THE PUBLIC CARRY OF FIREARMS

FROM: SALVATORE S. LANZILOTTI, EDD
Former Director of C&C of Honolulu Departments of Emergency Services,
Community Services, and Customer Services, and former Coordinator of
the Honolulu Metropolitan Medical Response System

DATE: FEBRUARY 20, 2023

I submit this testimony, with great apprehension, in support of **Bill 57: Relating to the Public Carry of Firearms**. As I grew up in Philadelphia and moved to Hawai'i 38 years ago, I have always felt a sense of safety here that I do not feel when on the mainland, especially when I travel to big cities. I can feel the difference in my body as muscles tighten when away and then automatically relax when returning home.

I have not felt the need for self-defense in Honolulu to the degree that I needed to carry a firearm. I fear that this condition will no longer exist due to the latest interpretation of the concept "right to bear arms" in the U.S. Constitution. In contradistinction to the *Heller decision of 2008* and the *MacDonald decision of 2010*, which both found that the right to bear arms is not *a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose*, in 2022 Supreme Court, in a 6-3 opinion written by Justice Clarence Thomas purported that there was *a constitutional right to bear arms in public for self-defense*. This submittal is not the place to litigate that issue but suffice it to say that the concept "*right to bear arms*" originally was written in response to the practice of British soldiers entering the homes of colonial settlers at will. Thus, it was a concept meant to provide protection from foreign invaders. Since the 1700's, the need for protection of our homes and our way of life domestically has been institutionalized by the establishment of our National Guard and Police Departments. That is how we collectively, as a community, have agreed on principle to bear arms. Consequently, I humbly suggest that in **Section 1. Purpose, Bill 57** be amended to "...an individual's Second Amendment right to bear arms **according to** the United States Supreme Court's ruling.... Given the history of this supposed "right" over the years, and especially since 2000, it seems prudent to indicate delicately that it is open to a variety of interpretations.

Bill 57 obviously creates a paradigm shift from our community being okay with its members owning a gun and keeping it in their homes for self-defense and/or being allowed to carry a gun amongst the public only if members have a sanctioned purpose for doing so (in September 2021 only 0.02% of Hawaii's population were licensed for concealed carry, which equated to around 281 people), to now having a community in which anyone can carry a gun in public who wants to do so and can qualify for a permit as long as they do not enter a "sensitive places" area. Consequently, while supporting Bill 57, I submit the following amendments for your consideration:

1. The misdemeanor penalty is too low for the potential violence that can occur when a population of people who feel only a psychological need to carry a gun are suddenly subjectively motivated to use the gun to protect themselves or others under conditions that they believe warrant the use of deadly force. I therefore submit that if we must have “sensitive zones” to protect our community then we should have severe penalties for imposing on that protection. I humbly suggest that Bill 57 be amended in all **Criminal Penalties; Enforcement** sections to **(1) Any person violating this section shall be guilty of a felony.**

2. In addition to the legal level of penalty you decide upon, please amend Bill 57 to **include the scope of the penalty**, e.g.: \$1,000 fine and/or up to one year in jail; conditions for immediate revocation of the gun permit and license; conditions for forfeiture of all owned firearms to the Police Department for a least one year or more; penalties that will occur if the statute is violated more than once, etc. Clear and severe penalties are warranted given the potential outcomes of the misuse of firearms in our community.

3. Amend Bill 57 to include a provision that will **prohibit leaving guns unattended in cars**. Such a provision can reduce the possibility of guns being robbed, disappearing into our community, and being used for illegal purposes.

4. Bill 57 seems to allow open carry in our community. I envision walking around Honolulu and seeing people wearing gun holsters on their hips. The most direct reference for this concern is in **Sec. 40._2. Definitions**, i.e., “*Carry on their person*” means the person has immediate physical access to the firearm, such as by carrying the firearm in a holster or other receptacle.” Can you clarify Bill 57 as to whether it allows both **open carry and concealed carry**?

5. Bill 57, **Sec. 40._2 Definitions**, states that a “*sensitive place*” means within the City. Can you clarify whether that includes the City & County of Honolulu, i.e., geographically Oahu, or as implied, only the defined urban boundaries of the city of Honolulu?

Finally, please know that I appreciate your efforts “to protect health, life, and property and to preserve the order and security of the City, its inhabitants, and its visitors”, especially our first responders who may be the most affected by the Supreme Court’s decision and this legislation.

Sincerely,

Salvatore S. Lanzilotti, Ed.D.
slanzilotti@gmail.com

TO: CITY COUNCIL, CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

RE: BILL 57: RELATING TO THE PUBLIC CARRY OF FIREARMS

FROM: SALVATORE S. LANZILOTTI, EDD
Former Director of C&C of Honolulu Departments of Emergency Services,
Community Services, and Customer Services, and former Coordinator of
the Honolulu Metropolitan Medical Response System

DATE: FEBRUARY 20, 2023

I submit this testimony, with great apprehension, in support of **Bill 57: Relating to the Public Carry of Firearms**. As I grew up in Philadelphia and moved to Hawai'i 38 years ago, I have always felt a sense of safety here that I do not feel when on the mainland, especially when I travel to big cities. I can feel the difference in my body as muscles tighten when away and then automatically relax when returning home.

I have not felt the need for self-defense in Honolulu to the degree that I needed to carry a firearm. I fear that this condition will no longer exist due to the latest interpretation of the concept "right to bear arms" in the U.S. Constitution. In contradistinction to the *Heller decision of 2008* and the *MacDonald decision of 2010*, which both found that the right to bear arms is not *a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose*, in 2022, the Supreme Court, in a 6-3 opinion written by Justice Clarence Thomas, purported that there was *a constitutional right to bear arms in public for self-defense*. This submittal is not the place to litigate that issue but suffice it to say that the concept "*right to bear arms*" originally was written in response to the practice of British soldiers entering the homes of colonial settlers at will. Thus, it was a concept meant to provide protection from foreign invaders. Since the 1700's, the need for protection of our homes and our way of life domestically has been institutionalized by the establishment of our National Guard and Police Departments. That is how we collectively, as a community, have agreed on principle to bear arms. Consequently, I humbly suggest that in **Section 1. Purpose, Bill 57** be amended to "...an individual's Second Amendment right to bear arms **according to** the United States Supreme Court's ruling.... Given the history of this supposed "right" over the years, and especially since 2000, it seems prudent to indicate delicately that it is open to a variety of interpretations.

Bill 57 obviously creates a paradigm shift from our community being okay with its members owning a gun and keeping it in their homes for self-defense and/or being allowed to carry a gun amongst the public only if members have a sanctioned purpose for doing so (in September 2021 only 0.02% of Hawaii's population were licensed for concealed carry, which equated to around 281 people), to now having a community in which anyone can carry a gun in public who wants to do so and can qualify for a permit as long as they do not enter "sensitive places" areas. Consequently, while supporting Bill 57, I submit the following amendments for your consideration:

1. The misdemeanor penalty is too low for the potential violence that can occur when a population of people who feel only a psychological need to carry a gun are suddenly subjectively motivated to use the gun to protect themselves or others under conditions that they believe warrant the use of deadly force. I therefore submit that if we must have “sensitive zones” to protect our community then we should have severe penalties for imposing on that protection. I humbly suggest that Bill 57 be amended in all **Criminal Penalties; Enforcement** sections to **(1) Any person violating this section shall be guilty of a felony.**

2. In addition to the legal level of penalty you decide upon, please amend Bill 57 to **include the scope of the penalty**, e.g.: \$1,000 fine and/or up to one year in jail; conditions for immediate revocation of the gun permit and license; conditions for forfeiture of all owned firearms to the Police Department for a least one year or more; penalties that will occur if the statute is violated more than once, etc. Clear and severe penalties are warranted given the potential outcomes of the misuse of firearms in our community.

3. Amend Bill 57 to include a provision that will **prohibit leaving guns unattended in cars**. Such a provision can reduce the possibility of guns being robbed, disappearing into our community, and being used for illegal purposes.

4. Bill 57 seems to allow open carry in our community. I envision walking around Honolulu and seeing people wearing gun holsters on their hips. The most direct reference for this concern is in **Sec. 40._2. Definitions**, i.e., “*Carry on their person*” means the person has immediate physical access to the firearm, such as by carrying the firearm in a holster or other receptacle.” Can you clarify Bill 57 as to whether it allows both **open carry and concealed carry**?

5. Bill 57, **Sec. 40._2 Definitions**, states that a “*sensitive place*” means within the City. Can you clarify whether that includes the City & County of Honolulu, i.e., geographically Oahu, or as implied, only the defined urban boundaries of the city of Honolulu?

Finally, please know that I appreciate your efforts “to protect health, life, and property and to preserve the order and security of the City, its inhabitants, and its visitors”, especially our first responders who may be the most affected by the Supreme Court’s decision and this legislation.

Sincerely,

Salvatore S. Lanzilotti, Ed.D.
slanzilotti@gmail.com

TESTIMONY IN STRONG SUPPORT OF BILL 57

My name is Marya Grambs and, while I am testifying as an individual, I was previously Executive Director of Mental Health America of Hawaii; I am currently President of the Board of Partners in Care's nonprofit arm and member of the Board of Directors of Waikiki Health; and I am a volunteer at IHS's Women's/Family Homeless Shelter.

If people having guns made us safer – and America now has literally more guns than people – ***we would not lead the world in mass murders and gun-related homicides and suicides.*** As it is, more and more of us now must be fearful in grocery stores, Walmart's, churches, dance clubs, shopping malls, synagogues, and movie theaters because of mass murders that have taken place – never mind elementary, middle, and high schools. Several generations of school children have now gone to school afraid they might face an “active shooter.” The recent Supreme Court's ruling is appalling. As if the second amendment's right to have a “well-regulated militia” means that everyone in America is allowed to have and to carry a gun! It makes no sense.

Bill 57 says guns can't be in schools, parks, shelters, and places like the zoos. That's fine, but I don't want guns in **grocery stores, restaurants, movie theaters, or bars.** Why should people like me have to worry that someone in the produce department might have a gun, or in the seat next to me at a movie theater, or at the table next to me at a restaurant? It's ridiculous, and scary, and unacceptable. It makes no sense. **Having guns all over the community does not make us safer.**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony. Please not only pass Bill 57, but expand the “sensitive places” where guns are not allowed.

City Council Bill 57 CD1

City Council District: 3
Constituent Stance: Oppose

Committee on Executive Matters and Legal Affairs
City Council Chamber
Wednesday, February 22, 2023
10 A.M.

Councilmembers,

I continue to **oppose** the City Council’s proposed **Bill 57 CD 1** because the bill continues to serve as a circumvention of the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen*.

Continuous Overexpansion of CCW Carry Prohibition

Bill 57 CD1 continues its overexpanded prohibitions of Conceal Carry Weapon (CCW) carry by disguising expanded prohibitions as so-called “sensitive places.”

For example, **Sec. 41._2 Definitions** continues to broadly define “Businesses” and “Business Establishments” to encompass virtually every single private business on the entire island that does not fall under express city county governmental purview. Such continued broad definition prevents businesses from distinguishing themselves as **private** entities that are distinctly separated from **public** governmental offices, such as those managed by the City and County of Honolulu. Moreover, **Bill 57 CD1** continues to restrict CCW licensee movement by banning CCW carry on parking lots within the proposed **§ 41-__4 Prohibition against the public carry of firearms on private businesses' or charitable establishments' premises without express consent**. Such continued prohibition making it difficult for CCW holders to complete basic every-day tasks such as dropping off their family members at businesses, retail establishments, and restaurants.

No Substantive Evidence of Public Safety Assurance by City and County

Bill 57 CD1 superficially purports that enhanced CCW restrictions will supposedly “...protect health, life, and property; and...preserve the order and security of the City, its inhabitants, and its visitors.” Readily observable evidence reveals that criminals continue to assail citizens and such criminal activity isn’t associated with increased legal CCW carry. As it turns out, criminals do not even need to use a gun to jeopardize the health, life, and security of Honolulu’s inhabitants:



Source: <https://www.hawaiinewsnow.com/2023/02/20/man-his-50s-seriously-injured-apparent-assault-kapolei/>

Woman, 48, seriously injured in apparent stabbing in Kalihi



Honolulu police are investigating a stabbing in Kalihi. (Hawaii News Now)

By HNN Staff

Published: Feb. 20, 2023 at 11:13 AM HST | Updated: 11 hours ago

Source: <https://www.hawaiinewsnow.com/2023/02/20/woman-48-seriously-injured-apparent-stabbing-kalihi/>



Source: https://www.kitv.com/news/crime/suspect-identified-charged-for-assaulting-hpd-officer-stealing-police-car/article_ddd8f8cc-af33-11ed-81f6-5be43c217833.html



Source: https://www.kitv.com/news/crime/suspect-in-deadly-kapiolani-hit-and-run-crash-released-from-jail/article_ef9fc500-aef8-11ed-beff-0fb6d98f22d0.html



For Ma, it's a wake-up call.

"Maybe two days ago, I was crossing and the light was green and this guy turned, he almost hit me, I was crossing right there. Yeah, he was just rushing or something. I got scared," he said. "I don't really feel safe crossing this intersection anymore."

Source: https://www.kitv.com/news/some-students-afraid-to-cross-busy-kapiolani-boulevard-after-fatal-hit-and-run/article_c1fe94c8-ada9-11ed-b552-bb753b4f9e03.html

Grand jury indicts man accused of attacking 2 people in Mililani Walmart parking lot

By Matthew Nuttle Feb 7, 2023 Updated Feb 8, 2023 1

Source: https://www.kitv.com/news/crime/grand-jury-indicts-man-accused-of-attacking-2-people-in-mililani-walmart-parking-lot/article_9c589f04-a749-11ed-ac54-a3ee11930635.html

Enduring Enforcement Concerns

Sec. 40-_.3 Prohibition against the public carrying of firearms in sensitive places. Subsection (c)(4) maintains its *prima facie* evidentiary threshold that continues to be problematic since not all private business property lines are clearly delineated by visible or readily identifiable boundary lines. In essence, a CCW license holder will always be at risk of violating the law without expressly having readily available information that clearly delineates a “sensitive place” and distinguishes it from a “non-sensitive place.” Essentially, the CCW license holder will still be forced to make a split-second assessment whether they are in compliance with the law wherever they go at any time.

Enduring Excessive Penalties without viable Recourse

Sec. 40-_.5 Prohibition against the public carry of firearms without possession of license to carry Subsection (a) maintains its aggressive posture by penalizing a CCW license holder with a misdemeanor charge **without** providing the CCW any means to rectify the situation, in emergency situations. This provision penalizes CCW carry under extreme duress, especially during times of emergency such as natural disasters, structural fires, or civil unrest where a CCW license holder may have to evacuate their residential dwelling unit.

Imposing a misdemeanor based solely upon a *prima facie* basis in **Sec. 40-_.5 Subsections (a) and (c)(4)** does not constitute a viable evidentiary basis since the CCW license holder may be responding to an emergency situation where they may not have easy access to their CCW license since it may be stored in a wallet or purse located in a separate room within their residence prior to residential evacuation. The aggressive wording in **Sec. 40-_.5 Subsection (5)** likewise continues to target the CCW license holder since it still does not account for instances of theft and consequently subjects the CCW license holder to immediate punishment without any viable recourse or remedy at the time of theft. Moreover, revisions to Chapter 15 of the Rules of the Chief of Police concerning CCW license issuance still do not include any provision for duplicative license issuance for any emergencies. This means that if a CCW license holder’s sole CCW license for a particular pistol is lost to the wind during a hurricane, stolen by a thief, or otherwise destroyed by a flood or fire, the CCW license holder will have no other way to identify their legal carry status unless they obtain a complete replacement from their respective county police department. Such duplicative license limitation creates artificial burden that continues to be forced upon the CCW license holder.

Focus on Public Safety

Because of the numerous repetitive prohibitions contained within **Bill 57 CD1**, I continue to urge that the Council use common sense and defer the bill indefinitely, especially since the State Legislator is already duplicating the City Council's prohibitive CCW efforts during its respective legislative session. That being said, the City Council's energy should be focused upon bolstering law enforcement officer staffing efforts to effectively mitigate criminal activity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Ryan C. Tinajero

Constituent of City Council District 3—Kāneʻohe



Aloha, Honolulu City Councilmembers:

My name is Erica Yamauchi, I live in Kaimukī, and I am testifying today in strong support of Bill 57. I am the statewide co-lead of Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, which currently has local groups on O‘ahu, Kaua‘i and Hawai‘i Island.

Guns don’t belong at schools, parks and other places where people gather and children play, but without this ordinance that’s exactly what will happen. We’ve already seen this take place on the Big Island, where their county council has left it up to each individual public park, playground and school to decide whether firearms are allowed or not allowed, which will only lead to confusion and negative interactions among public workers and community members.

As a mother of two young children, I don’t want to have to now wonder whether someone is carrying a gun every time I go into a local business or when I take my family to the zoo, playground, or the beach. It’s also just common sense that guns don’t belong in bars and restaurants where alcohol is being served.

Further, my husband and I are small business owners in Kaimukī, one of Honolulu’s best neighborhoods to live, work, shop and dine in. Many business owners like us don’t want the undue burden of having to create signage and/or have to tell people they can’t bring their firearms into our business. We especially appreciate this provision in Bill 57, where businesses must proactively state with signage that firearms are welcome.

More guns equal more gun violence. The idea that concealed guns could now be in these public places makes me feel less safe in our community, and honestly, it makes me sad that these special places on our island, in the background of our everyday lives, could now be potentially dangerous. Hawai‘i is currently one of the safest states in the nation, with one of the lowest rates of gun deaths per capita. This is not due to chance. It’s not by accident. It’s due to sound public policy, and we must do everything we can to protect our state, our families and our people.

I appreciate Mayor Blangiardi proposing this common-sense ordinance and I hope the Council will pass it quickly, as the new Honolulu Police Department rules are already in effect with potentially hundreds of public carry permits being approved very soon.

On behalf of Moms Demand Action’s Hawai‘i Chapter, local island groups and our members, I stand in strong support of Bill 57 and am grateful to you, our local leaders in Honolulu, who understand the importance of keeping firearms out of sensitive locations where the risk of harm is particularly high. We hope the ordinance passes and that the legislature will follow Honolulu’s lead by passing statewide legislation to address this pressing issue. Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Erica Yamauchi, State Co-Lead (Kaimukī/Wilhelmina Rise)

February 21, 2023

Bill 57 2022 CD1 Testimony

Aloha Chair of the Honolulu City Council, Council Members, and EMLA Chair Dos Santos-Tam.

Thank You for the opportunity to **testify in support of Bill 57 2022 CD1 (Dos Santos-Tam version)**.

- Due to SCOTUS' New York State Rifle and Pistol Association vs Bruen decision, I applaud the City and County of Honolulu's efforts to limit potential reach and harm of the said decision.
- As a registered firearm owner in the City and County of Honolulu, I believe Bill 57 will help bolster the CCW vetting process and prohibit firearms in a variety of places within the City and County.
- SCOTUS' decision did not hold that a state cannot require a license to carry a firearm in public, as mentioned in an article released by the San Diego Sherriff's Dept on 06/23/22.
- Per an article entitled Cal Matters that covers the California Legislature- the said SCOTUS decision bans enforcement agencies from awarding CCW permits on their own subjective discretion, though SCOTUS' ruling still left it open for states to add their own "objective" standards.
- The ruling also enables Counties and States to specify "sensitive" gun-free zones.
- Certain gun advocates continually argue that school shootings like those at Sandy Hook, Ulvalde, St. Louis Central Visual Performing Arts High, and the recent Half Moon Bay workplace shootings could be averted if more guns were available.
- Studies by Kellerman et al showed that in 1995, only 2.5 million guns were used to ward off crime nationally. The USA population is approximately 334,233,854 as of January 1, 2023. To date, there is no observable data supporting that more guns would/will stop gun violence in public places.
- Per the Gun Violence Archive, there have been a reported 39 shootings by the fourth week of January 2023 resulting in 69 deaths.
- I concur that CCW permit holders should not be allowed to bring firearms into schools, agencies that serve children, government buildings, polling places, and privately owned businesses. The onus should not be placed upon private owners- City legislation should cover this.
- I urge the City Council ensure that charitable establishments (as specified in Bill 57 2022 CD 1 on page 2) include non-profits serving persons with disabilities/children/vulnerable clients, victims of domestic violence in safe houses and emergency shelters.
- Further, regarding Sensitive Places Within the City (Bill 57 2022 CD1 page 4) to ensure that CCW permittees will be disallowed entirely within Honolulu Hale i.e., Mayor's and Managing Director's offices, Councilmembers and their staff offices, Honolulu Hale

cashiers, and all adjoining/outside departments including BFS, DPP, DFM, DDC, EMS, CUS, DPR, VID.

- As a retired social worker of 35 years I know only too well the effects of gun violence in domestic/child abuse, custody cases, and incarceration cases.
- I also worked as a Legislative Aid at the City Council and Committee Clerk at the State of Hawaii Legislature for a combined total of 11 years.
- On February 14, 2023, at the State Capitol- Chair David Tarnas publicly reported that a CCW permittee attended the JHA Committee hearing of HB984 with a handgun. The permittee reportedly informed the House Sergeant at Arms (HSAA) he was armed and was asked to leave.
- As a previous legislative aid/committee clerk I have observed the HSAA is consistently vigilant at public hearings.
- The State and City are diligently responding to the concerns of both the public and gun owners due to the said SCOTUS ruling. What was the purpose of CCW during the said JHA hearing?
- Lastly, I urge that the City Council include an addendum page from the City Corporation Counsel documenting its legal/constitutional checks for Bill 57 2022 CD1.

Thank You for the opportunity to **testify in support of Bill 57 2022 CD1 (Dos Santos-Tam version)**.
Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Leong

Assistive Technology Resource Centers of Hawaii (ATRC)
200 No. Vineyard Blvd, Ste 430
Honolulu, HI 96817

February 21, 2023

Bill 57 2022 CD1 Testimony

Aloha Chair of the Honolulu City Council, Council Members, and EMLA Chair Dos Santos-Tam.

Thank You for the opportunity to **testify in support of Bill 57 2022 CD1 (Dos Santos-Tam version)**.

- Due to SCOTUS' New York State Rifle and Pistol Association vs Bruen decision, I applaud the City and County of Honolulu's efforts to limit potential reach and harm of the said decision.
- As an advocate for persons with disabilities/vulnerable children and adults, I believe Bill 57 will help bolster the CCW vetting process and prohibit firearms in a variety of places within the City and County.
- SCOTUS' decision did not hold that a state cannot require a license to carry a firearm in public, as mentioned in an article released by the San Diego Sherriff's Dept on 06/23/22.
- Per an article entitled Cal Matters that covers the California Legislature- the said SCOTUS decision bans enforcement agencies from awarding CCW permits on their own subjective discretion, though SCOTUS' ruling still left it open for states to add their own "objective" standards.
- The ruling also enables Counties and States to specify "sensitive" gun-free zones.
- Gun advocates continually argue that school shootings like those at Sandy Hook, Ulvalde, St. Louis Central Visual Performing Arts High, and the recent Half Moon Bay workplace shootings could be averted if more guns were available.
- Studies by Kellerman et al showed that in 1995, only 2.5 million guns were used to ward off crime nationally. The USA population is approximately 334,233,854 as of January 1, 2023. To date, there is no observable data supporting that more guns would/will stop gun violence in public places.
- Per the Gun Violence Archive, there have been a reported 39 shootings by the fourth week of January 2023 resulting in 69 deaths.
- I concur that CCW permit holders should not be allowed to bring firearms into schools, non-profit agencies that serve persons with disabilities/children/vulnerable populations, government buildings, polling places, and privately owned businesses. The onus should not be placed upon private owners- City legislation should cover this.

- I urge the City Council ensure that charitable establishments (as specified in Bill 57 2022 CD 1 on page 2) include non-profits serving persons with disabilities/children/vulnerable clients, and victims of domestic violence in safe houses and emergency shelters.
- As the Executive Director of ATRC for 25 years, I know only too well the effects of gun violence in domestic/child abuse, abuse of persons with disabilities, and vulnerable populations.
- I am aware that on February 14, 2023, at the State Capitol- JHA Committee Chair David Tarnas publicly reported that a CCW permittee attended the hearing of HB984 with a handgun. The permittee reportedly informed the House Sergeant at Arms he was armed and was asked to leave.
- What was the purpose of the said permittee's behavior when the State and City are diligently responding to the concerns of both the public and gun owners?
- Lastly, I urge that the City Council include an addendum page from the City Corporation Counsel documenting its legal/constitutional checks for Bill 57 2022 CD1.

Thank You for the opportunity to **testify in support of Bill 57 2022 CD1 (Dos Santos-Tam version)**.
Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Fischlowitz-Leong
Executive Director, ATRC



The Institute for Human Services, Inc.
Ending the Cycle of Homelessness

TO: Chair Tommy Waters, Honolulu City Council

FROM: Connie Mitchell, Executive Director
IHS, The Institute for Human Services, Inc.

RE: Bill 57 - PUBLIC CARRY OF FIREARMS

HEARING: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 at 10:00 AM.

POSITION: IHS is in support of Bill 57 with amendments.

IHS, the Institute for Human Services has been providing emergency shelter services to adult men, women, and families with children on Oahu for over 40 years. In recent years, we have experienced an increase in conflicts and threats of bodily harm for guests, and even instances of persons threatening gun violence. Thus far, we have been fortunate to have not yet suffered tragedy as a result.

However, as laws evolve here in Hawaii to make guns generally more accessible, we would greatly appreciate the outlawing of firearms possession in homeless shelters, inclusive of those that serve adults exclusively.

In recent months we have intensified our searches upon entrance into our shelters and have uncovered weapons of all kinds, including guns in some instances. Homeless adults, many of whom are quite vulnerable, deserve to be protected from violence just as much as children.

The threat of gun violence has prompted our operations staff to undergo active shooter training, and we have established a zero tolerance for violence policy. We still endeavor to serve as many persons as possible and understand when tensions increase, people may have outbursts. But we must insist on a minimum level of civility to encourage discipline and personal *kuleana* to provide a safe sanctuary for all.

We support Bill 57 as it creates numerous measures to better protect our community, while complying with the federal mandate that public carry permits be allowed. We request the following amendments to more effectively meet our community's safety needs:

- A. **Expand “Sensitive places” for at-risk populations to include adult homeless shelters:** Section (c)(3) only includes shelters and at-risk programs serving children. The bill should include adult homeless shelters, programs serving adults being released from our corrections system and similar at-risk adults. Many of the guests served by these adult programs experience mental illness and/or substance use disorders where any presence of a firearm creates an unnecessary and imminent threat of deadly harm.
- B. **Require a “clear and conspicuous posting” if any of those property owners want to allow carrying of firearms on their properties:** Section 40-__4(a) only requires certain owners of property are permitted to provide express consent for carrying of firearms on their property, stating “Express consent may include signage.” This amendment would fairly provide notice to all persons who may otherwise wish to enter or patronize those



The Institute for Human Services, Inc.
Ending the Cycle of Homelessness

locations, that firearms may be present on the property. This will allow us all to make our own reasonable choices for self-protection. Thus, the operative phrase should require that the owner “provide express consent and clearly and conspicuously post a sign at the entrance of the building or on the premises indicating that license holders are permitted to carry firearms on the property.”

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Aloha,

I am providing written testimony in opposition to BILL 057(22).

The Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS), through the NYSRPA vs. Bruen decision, recently established “text, history, and tradition” as the new standard for jurisprudence regarding the Second Amendment. Any precedent analyzed using the text, history, and tradition method must have its origins rooted near the creation of the Second Amendment in 1791.

In regards to sensitive places, the SCOTUS ruling specifically mentioned polling places, schools, and government buildings as examples of sensitive places that historically prohibited the bearing of arms. Additional proposed locations noted in BILL 057(22) fail to provide historical context or justification for inclusion on a list of sensitive areas.

New York included all of the sensitive areas defined in BILL 057(22) in the Concealed Carry Improvement Act (CCIA), which was a response to the SCOTUS decision. U.S. District Court Judge Glenn Suddaby, among other judges, have already ruled large parts of the (CCIA), particularly many of the sensitive locations, are unconstitutional and do not adhere to text, history, and tradition.

Further, U.S. District Court Judge Renee Marie Bumb ruled New Jersey’s list of sensitive locations, which are very similar to New York’s, unconstitutional. Bumb also blocked the enforcement of carrying firearms on private property without the “express consent” of an owner or signage indicating firearms are allowed. The State’s default ban for firearms on private property essentially made a decision for an entire population. BILL 057(22) aims to replicate the same directive for private property.

BILL 057(22) has offered no validation for the list of sensitive places in accordance with the text, history, and tradition method set forth by SCOTUS. Banning the bearing of arms in various proposed sites, which mimic New York’s CCIA and New Jersey’s sensitive places list, has already been ruled unconstitutional. Numerous testimony alluded to these facts under review of the first version of BILL 057(22), but the City Council appears poised to move forward regardless, which is incredibly unfortunate.

Thank you.



Testimony to the Honolulu City Council
Wednesday, February 22, 2023
Council Chambers

In Support o Bill 57 (2022) CD1, Relating to the Public Carry of Firearms

To: The Honorable Tommy Waters, Chair
The Honorable Esther Kiaaina, Vice-Chair
Members of the Honolulu City Council

My name is Stefanie Sakamoto, and I am testifying on behalf of the Hawaii Credit Union League, the local trade association for 47 Hawaii credit unions, representing over 864,000 credit union members across the state.

HCUL offers the following comments in support of Bill 57 CD1 (2022), Relating to the Public Carry of Firearms.

Hawaii's credit unions are in strong support of the provision of the bill which defines sensitive locations; including financial institutions in this definition. Credit unions and banks already have a high risk of being robbed, and allowing concealed firearms into these establishments would definitely raise this risk, along with putting their staff and members in danger. We appreciate the legislature recognizing and taking action on this important matter.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this issue.



HAWAI'I LODGING & TOURISM
A S S O C I A T I O N

Testimony of
Mufi Hannemann
President & CEO
Hawai'i Lodging & Tourism Association

Honolulu City Council
Bill 57 (2022)
February 22, 2023

Chair Waters and members of the City Council, mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of the Hawai'i Lodging & Tourism Association, the state's oldest and largest private sector visitor industry organization.

The Hawai'i Lodging & Tourism Association—nearly 700 members strong, representing more than 50,000 hotel rooms and nearly 40,000 lodging workers—has long touted Hawai'i's status as one of the safest premier destinations to which one could travel. Our organization prioritizes public safety through various initiatives like our annual Visitor Public Safety Conference and via our advocacy for City programs like Safe & Sound Waikiki and Weed & Seed Hawai'i.

Following the ruling by the Supreme Court of the United States, our State and county governments were required to loosen local gun laws and begin issuing concealed carry permits. It is our position that an increase in the number of concealed firearms in our community threatens local residents and—by extension—our status as a safe destination.

With the significant shift in policy as a result of the SCOTUS ruling, Bill 57 (2022) will make it significantly easier for local businesses of all types to accommodate their patrons, keep them safe, and adhere to federal law without needing to invest in signage, training, or manpower.

At the same time, the measure allows for law-abiding gun owners to exercise their rights while limiting the number of concealed weapons in public, maintaining public safety.

For these reasons, HLTA supports Bill 57.

Mahalo for the opportunity to offer this testimony.



Testimony of Deb Nehmad
Support for BILL 57
Before the Honolulu City Council
February 22, 2023

My name is Deb Nehmad and I am testifying on behalf of Brady Hawaii. I am a resident of Hawaii Kai and I thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in support of BILL 57.

As the CDC recently noted, Hawaii has the second lowest gun death rate in the country. I am proud of the way Hawaii leadership has worked tirelessly to protect its constituents from the threat of gun violence. This safety has been threatened with the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Bruen*, which greatly weakened existing provisions of Hawaii's concealed carry permitting system.

Evidence has shown that states with weakened concealed carry permitting systems saw an increase of up to 15% in violent crime over a period of ten years. It has been reported that since the release of the *Bruen* decision, over 600 Hawaiians have reportedly applied for concealed carry permits. As of February 17, 2023, HPD had issued at least 35 permits **with no restrictions on where these guns may be carried in place!** The numbers are daunting: if Hawaii does not respond with immediate action to the SCOTUS decision, our lives will be put at risk.

Importantly, BILL 57 defines certain places where firearms cannot and should not be carried, including preschools, daycares, all forms of public transportation, hospitals and care facilities, establishments that sell liquor, public event spaces, playgrounds, parks and athletic areas open to the public and more. The Supreme Court in *Bruen* left it up to State legislatures to regulate firearms in these areas, and that is exactly what this bill does. The presence of guns in these areas is frankly

inappropriate and responsible gun owners agree that concealed weapons should have no place in these spaces.

It is also vitally important that ALL private property be included as sensitive places. There is nothing in the second amendment or the Bruen decision that extends the right to carry a weapon on PRIVATE property. The second amendment only refers to public property. Bill 57 places the burden of stating whether weapons will be permitted on private property on those who so choose. That's where it belongs. As Brady United noted in its legal filings on the New York State law, the Supreme Court recently held that the right to exclude gives property owners the ability to banish many constitutionally protected activities from their personal property. Furthermore, the 11th Circuit refused to turn the Heller decision on its head "by interpreting the Second Amendment to destroy one cornerstone of liberty – the right to enjoy one's private property – in order to expand another – the right to bear arms."

This is also a matter of public safety. The best analogy is the shop owners and/or their employees forced to enforce mask mandates on customers. The assumption should not be that someone can carry weapons onto your private property unless you are willing to confront them, bearing in mind they have a gun. It doesn't take a great leap of imagination to understand how intimidated a proprietor/employee would be having to enforce a no weapons policy against someone who assumes that the standard is that they have a right to bring their weapon onto your property. We would like to suggest, however, an amendment to the last sentence of Section 40_4(a) to make **signage mandatory** to indicate "express consent" that firearms are permitted on that property. Failure to do so can lead to potentially volatile situations.

We would also like to see that shelters for all homeless, not just children, are included in the list of sensitive places.

I respectfully urge all Council members to support the bill.

Deb Nehmad
Chapter Lead, Brady Hawaii

Dear Council members,

My name is Sue Hornik, I live in Honolulu, and I support Bill 57.

We all wish to keep our community as safe as possible and I want to thank the HPD for issuing strong rules on who may carry a concealed weapon and to the City Council for trying to clearly define where concealed weapons should not be carried.

It's inspiring to see that so many groups from every part of our community who represent tens of thousands of citizens – educators, nurses, doctors, faith leaders, business leaders, students – have testified in favor of a strong sensitive places bill.

I would first, however, urge the City Council to clarify the freedoms that licensed gun holders currently have, because the amount of disinformation being spread is disturbing. It is particularly important for everyone to know that Hawaii honors the Castle Doctrine meaning legal gun owners have the right to protect their family and their home and these proposed rules do not threaten that right.

What is at issue here today is quite different: Should licensed, concealed carry gun owners be allowed to bear hidden weapons on our streets, in our stores and churches, at our kids' schools, which have been so safe, in large part thanks to our earlier restrictions on who may carry a concealed weapon in public? Do we have to worry that someone feeling "threatened" by rowdy teens is going to pull out a gun and shoot one of our kids? Or that a friend could be killed because the gun owner deems them as suspicious and "shifty" as happened in the tragic FL case of teenager Trayvon Martin? Every reputable study shows that more guns on our streets equates to more gun injuries and deaths.

I strongly support Bill 57 and am relieved that the current bill retains the "default" provision as well as the extensive list of other "sensitive places" where guns cannot be carried. I ask Council members to support the current bill.

Finally, I would like to praise both members of the city council and community members who are speaking out in support of this bill. Guns are the only contentious issue where one side is armed and the other side is not. The sad result is that the majority of peaceful residents are often intimidated by the loud pro-gun minority. Hawaii has one of the smallest percentages of gun owners in the nation. Are the rest of us to be endangered because of their paranoia and obsession?

Sincerely,
Sue Hornik



February 21, 2023

RE: Testimony of Noelani Schilling-Wheeler Executive Director of O'ahu Visitors Bureau in SUPPORT of Bill 57, relating to the public carry of firearms.

Aloha e Honorable Chair Waters and Honorable Members of the City & County of Honolulu's City Council,

Our Island of O'ahu is known as the "gathering place" where families, friends, communities, and guests can come together with Aloha and feel safe when gathering. O'ahu should continue to be this safe gathering place for our residents and our visitors, *today and for future generations*. Bill 57 would ensure that private businesses and nonprofit organizations would be gun-free by default yet would allow property and business owners the **right to choose** – to allow or not allow guns on their property and, if they choose to allow guns, in what capacity (such as for security guards and personnel). Why is this measure currently only reserved for public places in Hawai'i? We believe it should be made available to private businesses and nonprofit organizations as well.

Our tourism industry is made up of products, services, and experiences that both residents and visitors enjoy every day, including but not limited to services at hotels, restaurants, shops and malls, attractions and much more. On Mother's Day and Father's Day, we as residents are also patrons of hotels and restaurants. During summer, our kids enjoy the shopping, activities, and attractions around O'ahu. As communities, we help nonprofit organizations to Mālama, care for, Hawai'i and host events at private establishments such as museums and theaters across Hawai'i. This industry also supports a significant local workforce – places our residents work at around the clock and throughout the year.

Bill 57 would protect both our residents and visitors by reducing chances of shootings by those carrying a firearm; allowing for better ability to protect our workforce, residents, and visitors; and would allow for better enforcement. It would help to reduce confrontations that may put our industry workforce – who are residents – at harm when confronted by individuals that carry guns. By allowing private businesses and nonprofit organizations to determine how guns should or should not be allowed at their place of service, employees have a choice to work there, can feel better protected, and can depend on law enforcement to manage the situation on the property they work on. This law would help to improve public safety by reducing the chance of a shooting - whether accidental or intentional - both in visitor areas as well as in the workplace areas of a private or nonprofit organization.

If this bill does not pass, organizations such as hospitals, places of worship, schools, private businesses, and other workplaces have a higher likelihood to a shooting – whether intentional or accidental. In a time where there is increase of shootings across the country, increases in mental health, and where private business and nonprofits organizations are continuing to struggle to maintain their services, not passing this bill places further burden on businesses, and subsequently on our economy and community at large. As an example, businesses and nonprofits will have to focus more and ensure that there is extra signage and communication, which is a cost. Perpetrators and victims can easily suggest that they did not see the signs or communication, and place further burden on a business – small or large – opening further liability for any shooting that happens at their place of business. And the business had no *choice* to have a gun-free zone on their property.

This bill will help to ensure that City & County of Honolulu continues to respect the community by its commitment to safety and its efforts towards mitigating gun violence. Why wouldn't we want to protect our residents, visitors, their families and our keiki?

We humbly ask this council to consider supporting Bill 57 and mahalo for this opportunity to testify.



Tuesday, Feb 21, 2023

City Council of Honolulu
530 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

RE: Bill 57(2022): A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE, RELATING TO THE PUBLIC CARRY OF FIREARMS – SUPPORT

Dear Members of the Honolulu City Council:

Everytown for Gun Safety, Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America are writing in support of Bill 57:

Everytown is the largest gun violence prevention organization in the country with nearly 10 million supporters including moms, mayors, survivors and everyday Americans who are fighting for public safety measures that respect the Second Amendment and help save lives. At the core of Everytown are Mayors Against Illegal Guns, Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and the Everytown Survivor Network.

Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America is a grassroots movement of Americans fighting for public safety measures that respect the Second Amendment and protect people from gun violence. Moms Demand Action campaigns for new and stronger solutions to lax gun laws and loopholes that jeopardize the safety of our children and families. Since its inception after the tragedy at Sandy Hook School, Moms Demand Action has established a chapter in every state of the country.

The Supreme Court's recent decision in [*New York State Rifle and Pistol Association v. Bruen*](#) invalidated New York's requirement that applicants seeking a license to carry a concealed handgun in public show "proper cause"—jeopardizing public safety in Hawai'i and other states with similar laws. The Court's decision is wrong, dangerous, and completely out of step with centuries of history and fundamental constitutional principles.

With a rate of 3.8 deaths per 100,000 people, Hawai'i has [one of the lowest rates of gun deaths](#) in the U.S. This is no accident—Hawai'i has the [second strongest set of gun safety laws in the country](#). Hawai'i is a national leader in gun violence prevention policy and has a long history of passing common-sense gun laws.

However, the Court's decision risks compromising those hard-won gains by making it easier for more people to carry concealed guns in Hawai'i communities and likely leading to significantly more guns in public places. By the end of December, media reports indicated [more than 600 permit applications](#) were pending in Honolulu County. Data out of Maryland, which is similarly affected by the *Bruen* decision, shows that from June 23-July 11, people submitted 5,314 new applications for wear and carry permits—a 772.6% increase from the same time last year. As our nation continues to experience horrific mass shootings, an onslaught of daily gun violence, and a spike in hateful armed extremism, more people carrying guns in public is the absolute last thing we need.



Let's be clear—strong concealed carry permit systems save lives. Research shows that in states that have already weakened their firearm permitting laws, the move was associated with an 11 percent rise in the rate of homicides with handguns¹ and a 13-15 percent increase in violent crime rates more broadly.² *Bruen* completely upended centuries of precedent and made all Hawai'i residents less safe in the process.

Thankfully, the Court made clear that states are still allowed to require a license to carry a firearm in public, and the *Bruen* decision also affirmed the constitutionality of laws prohibiting guns in “sensitive places” where governments historically prohibited them, such as schools, government buildings, polling places, and courthouses, as well as in “new and analogous” locations. Current Hawai'i law does not restrict license-holders from carrying weapons in almost any of those sensitive locations.

In a reality where more people may be carrying, it is critical that Honolulu County create a comprehensive list of the locations where guns should not be allowed. **These locations include places where alcohol is served, where families and children gather, where density and/or high emotions create a potentially dangerous atmosphere, where other constitutionally protected activities take place (e.g., voting, public assemblies and other expressive activities), and where sensitive business is conducted.** We are pleased to see such locations in Bill 57. In order to set consistent understandings of where firearms are allowed, Bill 57 also specifies that firearms would be prohibited at business establishments or charitable organizations unless the establishment has expressly consented to the presence of firearms, which they can do by posting clear signage if they choose to allow firearms on the property. **Setting a default presumption that firearms will not be allowed unless a private business or property owner consents to their presence is a prudent way to avoid confusing long-standing public expectations in a state like Hawai'i where there has historically been very little public carrying of firearms.**

For these reasons listed above, Everytown for Gun Safety, Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America support the Council's proposed Bill 57. We encourage you to pass this bill, and hope that the state will follow Honolulu's lead by passing statewide legislation to address this pressing issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sarah Sumadi".

Sarah Sumadi
Associate Regional Director for State Government Affairs, Western Region
Everytown for Gun Safety, Moms Demand Action & Students Demand Action
450 Lexington Ave.
New York, NY 10163
ssumadi@everytown.org

¹ Michael Siegel et al., “Easiness of Legal Access to Concealed Firearm Permits and Homicide Rates in the United States,” *American Journal of Public Health* 107, no. 12 (December 1, 2017): 1923–29, <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/10.2105/AJPH.2017.304057>.

² John J. Donohue, Abhay Aneja, and Kyle D. Weber, “Right-to-carry Laws and Violent Crime: A Comprehensive Assessment Using Panel Data and a State-Level Synthetic Control Analysis,” *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 16, no. 2 (2019): 198-247.



Ryan Tanaka, Chairman – Giovanni Pastrami **Ave Kwok, Incoming Chair**- Jade Dynasty

Tambara Garrick, Secretary – Hawaii Farm Project

Kahili Soon, Treasurer – Hukilau Marketplace

Greg Maples, Past Chair – Polynesian Cultural Center

Sheryl Matsuoka, Executive Director **Ginny Wright, Operations Assistant** **Holly Kessler, Director of Membership Relations**

2022- 23

Board of Directors

Lee Anderson
Noa Aoki
Robert Bach
Javier Barberi
Andy Huang
Tim Januszewski
Tom Jones
Felix Koeppenkastrop
Ashley Leal
Victor Lim
Conan Paik-Rosa
Mike Palmer
Tyler Roukema
Michael Skedleski
Alison "Bo" Tanaka
Katy Tanaka
Tina Wang
Alan Wiltshire
Anthony Wong
Nicholas Wong
Paul Yokota

Allied Members

Rockey Bustamante
Louis Chun
Hugh Duncan
James Idemoto
Christopher Lee
Scott Meichtry
Raymond Orozco
Bryan Pearl
Jason Wong

Advisory Board

Jerry Agrusa
Biff Graper
John Richards
Richard Turbin

Date: February 22, 2023
To: Committee on Executive Matters and Legal Affairs
From: Ryan Tanaka, Chairman of the Hawaii Restaurant Association
Subject: Bill 57, CD1 (2022) Relating to the Carry of Firearms

Aloha Chair Waters and Honolulu City Councilmembers. The Hawaii Restaurant Association (“HRA”) supports Bill 57, CD1 relating to the carry of firearms. HRA represents approximately 100,000 employees at over 4,000 eating and drinking place locations. We appreciate that bars and restaurants have been named as a business establishment, and that this bill would prevent the public from carrying firearms in bars and restaurants. Health and safety for our restaurant workers, customers, and the public is our top priority. Specifically, the public wouldn’t want someone even partially intoxicated to have access to, let alone carry a concealed firearm.

Although this is a statewide issue, we agree with City Administration that decisive action on this issue is warranted because Oahu residents and visitors need to feel safe. Bill 57, CD1 would be a deterrent and demonstrate that simply put, Hawaii is not a gun culture. Due to the various versions of Bill 57, CD1, we hope Honolulu City Administration and Honolulu City Council can come to an agreement on language on this important topic.

If putting up signs at restaurants will be required after this bill is passed, please consider with only a few dozen permit holders compared to nearly 10 million annual visitors, it would be a challenge to ask over 4,000 restaurant locations to put up signs voluntarily for this measure. It could also be confusing and difficult to enforce if certain restaurants put up signs and others didn’t, especially if there was disagreement on the visibility of the signs. Restaurant owners and customers wouldn’t want constant reminders of firearms and restaurant workers would not be expected to check each customer so there could be question as to enforceability.

Bill 57, CD1 has semblance to the statewide smoking ban. Since the bill was passed in 2006, smoking was banned statewide in all enclosed or partially enclosed workplaces in Hawaii, including the indoor and outdoor portions of all bars and restaurants. Signs were not required to be placed once the statewide smoking ban went into effect. Today, Hawaii residence enjoy a smoke-free restaurant and bar culture.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify and for all you do for the City & County of Honolulu.





February 22, 2023

Aloha Honolulu City Council Members:

My name is Rechung Fujihira, I am a resident of Mō'ili'ili and I am a small business owner in Kaka'ako. I am submitting testimony today in support of Bill 57 because I firmly believe firearms do not belong in the places in which our community gathers such as schools and parks. I also believe it is common sense that we do not allow firearms to be in establishments where alcohol is served and I believe that without this ordinance, we will see confusion as to what is and what is not allowed, as well as the danger that comes with suddenly allowing firearms to be anywhere and everywhere. As someone born and raised here, it saddens me to see that we have to debate this issue as Hawai'i has always felt like a safe community as well as being one of the safest states because of our low rates of gun violence. I believe that up until this recent Supreme Court decision, it was by design that we have lived with such a sense of peace.

As a longtime business owner, I don't want to have to worry about keeping guns out of our establishment and dealing with the potential of having to inform customers they cannot bring in their firearms into our business; it's an undue burden on myself and my team. That's why I'm appreciative of the provision in Bill 57, where businesses must proactively state with signage that firearms are welcome instead.

I hope the City Council will pass this measure quickly so that as a business owner, I don't have to worry about this additional burden alongside running a business. Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Mahalo nui,
Rechung Fujihira