



TESTIMONY  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
SB1030 SD1 RELATING TO ELECTIONS  
Friday, February 21, 2025, at 10:20 AM, State Capitol CR 016

Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Gabbard and Members of the Committees,

The Hawaiian Islands Republican Women supports ensuring a safe and secure voting process.

The Hawaiian Islands Republican Women **STRONGLY OPPOSE** SB1030 for the following reasons:

1. There are currently sufficient laws protecting voters as well as laws defining election procedures.
2. What constitutes “intimidation” in SB1030? This is subjectively stated in SB1030.
3. If someone is perceived to be intimidating, does that equate to election fraud? NO

The US Elections Assistance Commission (EAC) defines election fraud as, “The misrepresentation or alteration of the true results of an election.” Source: [www.eac.gov](http://www.eac.gov)

The use of the word “intimidation” to the term “election fraud” has no literal relationship. It creates a term that technically has nothing to do with the definition of election fraud.

SB1030 duplicates already existing Sensitive Places law. Is this an “elections” bill or is this a bill designed to infringe upon our 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights?

SB1030 proposes to unlawfully reextend Sensitive Places to certain public places that have been successfully challenged in court. Ballot drop boxes are in public parks.

The August 8, 2023, ruling on Hawai’i’s Sensitive Places law in the United States District Court, District of Hawaii in Woford vs. Lopez case struck down the section of the law pertaining to firearms at public parks.

All of Oahu’s ballot places of deposit are in public parks, except the ones at Kapolei Hale and Honolulu Hale. The other counties also have ballot places of deposit in parks. This bill is in direct contradiction to the Woford vs. Lopez case.

Finally, any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is void and unenforceable.

Please vote NO on SB1030 SD1. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Respectfully submitted,

Jamie Detwiler, President  
Hawaiian Islands Republican Women

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/18/2025 7:47:54 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Michael Golojuch, Jr. (he/him)	Testifying for Pride at Work – Hawai‘i	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Senators,

Pride at Work – Hawai‘i is an official chapter of [Pride at Work](#) which is a national nonprofit organization that represents LGBTQIA+ union members and their allies. We are an officially recognized constituency group of the AFL-CIO that organizes mutual support between the organized Labor Movement and the LGBTQIA+ Community to further social and economic justice.

Pride at Work – Hawai‘i fully supports SB 1030 SD 1.

We ask that you support this needed piece of legislation.

Mahalo,

Michael Golojuch, Jr. (he/him)

President

[Pride at Work – Hawai‘i](#)



Randy Perreira  
President

# HAWAII STATE AFL-CIO

888 Mililani Street, Suite 501 • Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Telephone: (808) 597-1441  
Fax: (808) 593-2149

The Thirty-Third Legislature  
The Senate  
Committee on Judiciary

Testimony by  
Hawaii State AFL-CIO

February 21, 2025

## TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SB1030 SD1 – RELATING TO ELECTIONS

Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Gabbard, and members of the committee:

The Hawaii State AFL-CIO is a state federation of 76 affiliate labor organizations representing over 69,000 union members across Hawaii in industries including healthcare, construction, hospitality, entertainment, transportation, and government. The AFL-CIO serves its affiliates by advocating for the rights of working families, promoting fair wages, ensuring safe working conditions, and supporting policies that strengthen Hawaii's workforce.

We are in support of SB1030 SD1 because it promotes safe and accessible elections, ensuring that every voter can exercise their constitutional rights free from intimidation or coercion. Clear restrictions on carrying firearms or weapons near voter service centers and polling places are essential to preserving the integrity of Hawaii's elections and fostering a secure environment for voters.

Protecting the electoral process is fundamental to our democracy. This measure will reduce the risk of voter suppression and ensure elections remain a place where every voice is heard without fear or undue influence.

We respectfully urge the committee to pass this measure to uphold the principles of free and fair elections for the people of Hawaii.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Randy Perreira". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Randy Perreira  
President

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/18/2025 5:33:06 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Andrew Crossland	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I **strongly oppose** and urge this committee to **VOTE NO** on SB1030 SD 1, which aims to amend the laws regarding election fraud with specific implications that could infringe upon the rights of law-abiding citizens. Here are several compelling reasons why this legislation should be rejected:

**1. Constitutional Rights at Risk:**

- This bill introduces restrictions on carrying firearms or weapons within 200 feet of voter service centers, places of deposit, or polling places. Such a provision directly challenges the Second Amendment rights of individuals to bear arms for personal protection. The right to carry for self-defense should not be nullified based on one's location, especially in public spaces during democratic processes like voting.

**2. Vagueness and Overreach:**

- The language concerning what constitutes "election fraud intimidation" with firearms is overly broad. It could criminalize lawful behavior and lead to arbitrary enforcement. For instance, what if one is simply passing through such an area on their way to or from another location? This bill could inadvertently turn citizens into unintentional lawbreakers.

**3. Lack of Clear Evidence:**

- There is no solid evidence presented that firearms near polling places have historically led to voter intimidation or suppression. Without empirical data supporting such a linkage, this bill seems to be a solution in search of a problem, potentially driven more by fear than by fact.

**4. Potential for Misuse:**

- The bill could be used to selectively enforce laws against certain groups or individuals, thus potentially fostering an environment of political bias. The fear of legal repercussions might deter citizens from exercising their rights to vote or to carry for self-defense, creating a chilling effect on democratic participation.

## **5. Alternatives Exist:**

- Instead of imposing blanket restrictions, better solutions could involve enhancing security measures around voting locations, educating the public on voter rights and responsibilities, and ensuring that any real threats are dealt with by law enforcement in a manner that respects civil liberties.

## **6. Impact on Election Workers and Volunteers:**

- Election officials and volunteers, who are often unarmed, might feel safer knowing that law-abiding citizens can legally carry for protection. Restricting this could place undue stress on those who ensure our elections run smoothly, potentially reducing the number of people willing to serve in these roles.

**Conclusion:** This bill threatens to undermine fundamental rights and could lead to unintended negative consequences for voter turnout and civic engagement. I urge you to consider these points and **VOTE NO** on SB1030 SD 1. Let us maintain a balance between security and liberty, ensuring that our democratic processes remain accessible and safe for all participants.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/18/2025 6:57:49 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Michael I Rice	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

## Comments:

I stand in **Strong Opposition** to this bill. It attempts to criminalize one right while exercising another and is poorly worded and thought out. Simply walking within a certain distance of a mailbox with a self defense tool would now be a crime without any intent to intimidate or harass other voters. And given that Hawai'i engages in early voting, it would mean weeks of people being forbidden to go near these places or face arrest.

Current laws should be enough to prevent this, or at least allow for add on charges for those who would break this law as it currently is. Openly carrying a firearm is not available to the average citizen and is a crime. If someone is concealing a firearm, how can they be acting in a manner meant to threaten someone? They can't, as they would need to make a verbal or visual threat which is already covered under this law. Brandishing a firearm on its own is a crime, and doing the same with any other dangerous implement can catch you a terroristic threatening charge.

And again this bill is so poorly worded that now law enforcement would be breaking the law if they simply go near a polling place and are simply doing their jobs and would leave such places vulnerable. Yet if you were to attempt to fix this by amending an exemption for police officers or security guards, it could easily be abused by those officers who would wish to intimidate others during an election.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/18/2025 8:51:11 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mike Golojuch, Sr.	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I support SB1030. Please pass this bill.

Mike Golojucj, Sr.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/18/2025 10:26:09 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Carolyn M Martinez-Golojuch	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

There is no need for anyone to carry a gun to polling location.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 8:45:18 AM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Bronson Teixeira	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha, I stand in strong opposition to this bill.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 8:52:34 AM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marcus Tanaka	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose. You shouldn't lose 1 right in order to exercise the ability to vote.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 8:53:57 AM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Gavin Heideman	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

## Comments:

Aloha, this bill should not be passed. Creating laws specifically targeting law abiding gun owners simply to attack the practice is abuse of legal powers. Removing intent and circumstances from the law is unjust and is not how our community should be treated. You are using the law to oppress people who live in a way that you do not condone.

Do not pass this or similar bills that only affect non-criminals. Because criminals do not care about the law.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 9:06:49 AM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Eric Apaka	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

What a waste of time and money. Once again, making rules against law abiding citizens. Why don't we start cracking down on criminals? That's where the problem lies.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 6:21:26 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Eric Kaneshiro	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

The specified changes are unnecessary. Thank you for your consideration.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 7:14:47 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kevin J. Cole	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

## Comments:

Aloha, I oppose SB1030. As currently worded, SB1030 would expand the current 'Voter Intimidation' laws to include simply carrying a gun or weapon (such as a baton) within 250 feet of a voting area or drop box. Why a drop box? Is it a crime to walk by a drop box in a public place if armed? Brandishing a Firearm is already a crime. This bill is not needed.

V/R

Kevin J. Cole, Col USAF ret

Mililani

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 7:39:22 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Robert A Okuda	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Dear Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Gabbard, and Committee Members,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Senate Bill 1030 SD1, which seeks to define election fraud intimidation to include carrying any firearm or weapon within 200 feet of a voter service center, place of deposit, or polling place.

While I understand the intent to ensure a safe and intimidation-free environment for voters, I believe this bill is unnecessary and may infringe upon the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. Existing laws already address voter intimidation and unlawful use of firearms. Implementing additional restrictions could inadvertently penalize responsible individuals who legally carry firearms for self-defense.

Moreover, there is no substantial evidence to suggest that the presence of legally carried firearms has led to incidents of voter intimidation or election fraud in our state. This bill could create unintended consequences, such as deterring lawful citizens from exercising their Second Amendment rights without effectively addressing the issue of election security.

I respectfully urge the committee to consider these concerns and oppose the passage of SB1030 SD1.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this matter.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 7:49:42 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Duke malczon	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Strongly oppose

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 9:48:00 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Carl Laugerbaum	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I strongly oppose this bill.

This bill is not needed, brandishing a firearm or weapon in public is already a crime.

This bill is targeting gun owners and law abiding citizens and is unnecessary and infringes on the constitutional right to carry a firearm.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/19/2025 9:50:59 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
lynne matusow	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

## Comments:

Unfortunately it has come to this. Having seen news reports with Felon Trump's supporters, some carrying guns, intimidating both voters and elections officials on the mainland we must be ever vigilant and prepared here in Hawaii nei. Please move this common sense bill forward.

Senator Karl Rhoads, Chair  
Senator Mike Gabbard, Vice Chair  
Committee on Judiciary (JDC)  
Hearing: Friday, February 21, 2025, at 10:20AM  
Regarding: **SB1030 SD1 (Relating to Firearms)**  
**Voter Position: OPPOSITION**

Senators of the JDC Committee,

I express my **opposition** to **SB1030 SD1 (Relating to Firearms)**.

### **Hostile Legislative Focus**

**SB1030 SD1** is a politicized legislative proposal that is expressly designed to portray all lawful self-defense carry of firearms as a form of intimidation. This fact is plain and simple—there is no true public safety objective of **SB1030 SD1** other than to restrict the lawful, non-intimidating carry of defensive tools, such as concealed firearms used for individual self-defense, in public.

**SB1030 SD1** essentially creates an artificial “intimidation carry” violation whereby the simple exercise of a constitutional and human right to self-protection **near** polling places is turned into an act of election fraud. Firearm owners that seek to acquire Concealed Carry Weapon (CCW) licenses primarily acquire such licenses to protect themselves from violent criminal actors whenever there is an absence of law enforcement personnel. **SB1030 SD1** restricts that defensive, non-intimidating self-defense capability by limiting the safe movement of CCW license holders as they navigate through the state and the various polling places during election season.

### **Strange Legislative Perspective**

Law enforcement officers carry firearms, uninhibited, in many public places at all times and are not considered to intimidate the public simply through the act of carrying a firearm. Unlike with CCW license holders, law enforcement officers have their firearms visible and are readily accessible by the officer at all times at virtually any location on the island where they are present. Law enforcement officers that openly carry firearms at many public locations possess training concerning the operation and lawful use of their firearms. In a similar manner, CCW license holders possess training concerning the operation and lawful use of their concealed firearm, that is **not visible** in public and **not presented** for any act of intimidation. Despite this similarity, **SB1030 SD1** intentionally portrays *any* CCW license holder, or any firearm owner for that matter, as an intimidating force of evil, simply by the act of firearm carry. No visible presentation or display of a firearm is even needed for such violation to occur, thanks to the hostile and intentional wording of **SB1030 SD1**. Both law enforcement officers and CCW license holders may carry similar firearms, such as pistols, and they may even conduct the same action, that is, to simply carry a pistol. Despite such similarities, **SB1030 SD1** still portrays *any* individual that happens to carry a lawful firearm for lawful self-protection purposes as an individual that seeks to intimidate anyone around them simply because the individual isn’t serving as a law enforcement officer. Such thought is preposterous and doesn’t demonstrate an added public safety value.

### **Problems with Enforceability**

Lawful CCW license holders would be subject to undue scrutiny whenever they happen to be in proximity of polling places, voter service centers, or places of deposit that don’t have clearly visible borders or other notable demarcations showing the end of their respective two-hundred-radius. Moreover, there is the

possibility that a de facto “stop and frisk” enforcement style may be imposed upon the public, specifically known CCW license holders, since **SB1030 SD1** doesn’t expressly prohibit such tactic, nor does it delineate the limitations of any such search should it be initiated. CCW license holders may potentially be subjected to questioning at the fringes of polling places, voter service centers, or places of deposit, even if they are not actively carrying a concealed firearm on that particular day. The potential for unnecessary questioning always exists since a two-hundred-foot radius can encompass a multitude of businesses and other private commercial establishments near a multitude of polling places, voter service centers, or other places of deposit. Hawaii is a small island, after all, so it wouldn’t be a surprise for a law enforcement officer that processes CCW license paperwork to encounter a CCW license applicant at a location within the radius of known polling places, voter service centers, or places of deposit.

### **Focus on Stopping Current Criminal Activity**

When viewing the world through the lens of reality, law enforcement officers cannot readily respond to the needs of every individual within public view at every location at every time of the day. Criminals know this and seek to prey upon any individual they perceive to be unarmed and unable to defend themselves. **SB1030 SD1** would simultaneously create a public harm and cause a real intimidation situation whereby criminals will proceed to harm any individual in their proximity at any location (such as polling places) without any viable deterrence. Criminals are inherently irrational threat-based actors and will seek to impose their will anywhere at any time. They don’t care that someone is unarmed and within the radius of a voter service center, place of deposit, or polling place. They’ll do whatever harm that comes to mind, whether it’s intimidation, or any other form of crime.

Intimidation occurs in many forms, including by means of hostile legislation. if the legislative intent is to stop intimidation at polling places, then simply enforce current laws and stop those who actively seek to commit the actual act of intimidation, whether the offending party is committing such act, with or without a firearm, at any location, polling place, or otherwise.

Thank you for taking the time to review this testimony.

Respectfully,

Ryan C. Tinajero

Constituent of **Senate District 23**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 6:18:16 AM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Woody Child	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I strongly OPPOSE SB1030.

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 6:36:17 AM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jerry Ilo	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This does nothing to protect us from criminals.

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 12:27:46 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Charles Tom	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This bill would expand the "Voter Intimidation" laws to include simply carrying a gun or a weapon-e.g. a baseball bat- within 250 feet of a voting area or a drop box. Why a drop box? Is it a crime to walk by a drop box in a public area if armed? Who will enforce this? What is the penalty? Even my wife thinks this is a ridiculous bill that is not needed. Focus attention on the real problems that we have-inflation, homeless, etc.

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 12:33:55 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
taylor sumida	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I opposed this it is not needed

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 5:11:05 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Chase Cavitt	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I am writing my testimony in opposition of SB1030. This bill has far too many opportunities to be abused and misused to take legal action against someone who is not even close to attempting to break a law or intimidate someone. It is illegal for a citizen to use a firearm to intimidate someone for any reason. From my understanding, the simple possession of a concealed carry licensed firearm holder possessing a legally carried firearm in the vicinity of a place listed, would then be a criminal act. This bill now clarifies the distance a person cannot be in possession of a firearm add within 200ft. This is trivial and troublesome and goes against current concealed carry laws that allow firearms to be stored in a vehicle when entering an area where they are not allowed to be legally carried. It's already illegal to drive with a firearm to anywhere but an approved place in Hawaii without a concealed carry license for that particular firearm. So this basically only is incriminating law abiding concealed carry license holders. These are not the criminals. This bill is unnecessary and unconstitutional as well. What if someone is legally carrying and a anti firearm group surrounds them? What if they are assaulted with a deadly weapon and are forced to use this legally licensed concealed carry firearm to protect the life of themselves or another and are within the determined distance of a voting station? They could be doing nothing to do with voting and be charged for criminal acts of election fraud as the result. I have never heard of a single voter intimidated with firearm in Hawaii and I do not believe this is a genuinely needed Bill to pass into law. This is another form of intimidation against firearm owners to be told to keep in line and don't mess with the political party that threatens to destroy the second amendment. This state already is working to pass more unconditional laws and I feel this is a bill being pushed forward in order to remove more law abiding firearm owners from being able to own firearms in Hawaii by making criminals out of law abiding firearm owners. This bill is not going to stop anything from happening if someone has bad intentions. Current laws already in place make it illegal to brandish or intimidate someone with a firearm in Hawaii. This bill is unnecessary. Please vote No on SB1030.

Mahalo,

Chase Cavitt

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 5:21:13 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Tenessa Cavitt	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I am writing my testimony in opposition of SB1030. This bill has far too many opportunities to be abused and misused to take legal action against someone who is not even close to attempting to break a law or intimidate someone. It is illegal for a citizen to use a firearm to intimidate someone for any reason. From my understanding, the simple possession of a concealed carry licensed firearm holder possessing a legally carried firearm in the vicinity of a place listed, would then be a criminal act. This bill now clarifies the distance a person cannot be in possession of a firearm add within 200ft. This is trivial and troublesome and goes against current concealed carry laws that allow firearms to be stored in a vehicle when entering an area where they are not allowed to be legally carried. As a woman, a mother and a law abiding citizen in Hawaii, this bill would not make me feel safer. I would feel better knowing other law abiding concealed carry license holders could possibly be there to help someone if needed. I also plan to eventually obtain a concealed carry license as well. I would appreciate the ability to exercise my constitutional rights to protect myself.

It's already illegal to drive with a firearm to anywhere but an approved place in Hawaii without a concealed carry license for that particular firearm. So this basically only is incriminating law abiding concealed carry license holders. These are not the criminals. This bill is unnecessary and unconstitutional as well. What if someone is legally carrying and a anti firearm group surrounds them? What if they are assaulted with a deadly weapon and are forced to use this legally licensed concealed carry firearm to protect the life of themselves or another and are within the determined distance of a voting station? They could be doing nothing to do with voting and be charged for criminal acts of election fraud as the result. I have never heard of a single voter intimidated with firearm in Hawaii and I do not believe this is a genuinely needed Bill to pass into law. This is another form of intimidation against firearm owners to be told to keep in line and don't mess with the political party that threatens to destroy the second amendment. This state already is working to pass more unconditional laws and I feel this is a bill being pushed forward in order to remove more law abiding firearm owners from being able to own firearms in Hawaii by making criminals out of law abiding firearm owners. This bill is not going to stop anything from happening if someone has bad intentions. Current laws already in place make it illegal to brandish or intimidate someone with a firearm in Hawaii. This bill is unnecessary. Please vote No on SB1030.

Mahalo,

Tenessa Cavitt

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 8:41:57 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Sam Cavitt	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Hawaii State Lawmakers,

I am writing in opposition of SB1030 and urge you to oppose this bill as well. I am a law-abiding citizen of The United States of America and Hawaii, a taxpayer, registered voter, a husband, father, grandfather and also an owner of legal firearms. I own them because I admire the technology and enjoy using them at firing ranges and hunting. I also own them to exercise my right as a US Citizen and Hawaii Citizen per the Constitutions of The USA and the State of Hawaii. I am a constituent of yours and by denying me these rights you are misrepresenting me. interestingly enough, as I have spoken to many who share my opinion of these basic rights, many are in the dark about what our state legislation is doing in denying our rights. As such, I would expect a groundswell of outcry against this law, if it passes. That will result in legal action, likely to the Supreme Court, and much cost and greater division in our country. It may also result in law abiding citizens breaking the law unintentionally. People who do no harm to others, being harmed by this law. These things would be detrimental to us all.

**Specific Arguments Against SB1030**

- 1. Creates Unnecessary Legal Risks for Law-Abiding Citizens**
  - The bill expands restrictions on firearm possession within **200 feet** of certain locations, making it easier for legal gun owners to be prosecuted even if they are not engaging in any criminal activity.
  - Concealed carry permit holders following existing laws could unintentionally violate this rule simply by being near a restricted area.
- 2. Contradicts Existing Concealed Carry Laws**
  - Current concealed carry laws allow for **firearms to be stored in vehicles** when entering prohibited areas.
  - Hawai'i already has strict transport laws, requiring firearms to be transported only to approved locations.
  - This bill unfairly targets legal **concealed carry license holders**, not criminals.
- 3. Fails to Address Actual Crime**
  - There is **no documented issue** of voter intimidation with firearms in Hawai'i.
  - Current laws **already prohibit brandishing or using a firearm to intimidate others**.
  - Criminals do not follow gun laws, so this bill will **only impact law-abiding citizens** while doing nothing to prevent crime.

#### 4. **Potential for Misuse & Abuse**

- The broad nature of the bill **could be used to prosecute individuals unfairly**, even if they are not threatening or intimidating anyone.
- Anti-gun groups could **intentionally provoke** a licensed carrier and then claim they were intimidated.
- A person lawfully carrying a firearm could face criminal charges for **self-defense** if an incident occurs near a restricted area.

#### 5. **Political Targeting of Gun Owners**

- The bill appears to be a **form of intimidation** against firearm owners rather than a necessary safety measure.
- It could be part of a broader effort to **erode Second Amendment rights** by increasing restrictions until firearm ownership is nearly impossible.

#### 6. **Unconstitutional & Likely to Face Legal Challenges**

- The bill violates **concealed carry rights** and could be struck down under recent Supreme Court decisions (e.g., Bruen).
- If passed, the law would **cost taxpayers money** in legal battles, only to be likely overturned.

### **Conclusion**

SB1030 is unnecessary, redundant, and an overreach that unfairly targets **law-abiding** firearm owners while doing nothing to prevent crime. The bill increases the risk of **unjust prosecutions**, conflicts with existing concealed carry laws, and could be misused for political purposes.

#### **General arguments against all current proposed gun legislation in Hawaii are –**

The bills are unnecessary, ineffective, and infringing on Second Amendment rights.

The legislation targets law-abiding gun owners rather than criminals.

The laws will create legal traps for gun owners through vague wording and overreach.

The bills are politically motivated rather than factually justified.

Crime prevention should focus on criminals, not restricting legal gun ownership.

It poses the question of why this bill is being considered. Some will say to make us safer. I disagree. This bill is not founded on fact and reason but rather fear and myth. Please step back from the brink and let's work together as Americans and Hawaiians to heal our society and maintain the basic rights that our respective constitutions guarantee. Vote no on SB1030.

Thank You!

Aloha,

Sam Cavitt

Kihei, HI

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 8:47:21 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jacob Wiencek	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Committee Members,

I am glad to see this bill continue through the legislative process. Unfortunately, the explosive growth of election-related disinformation and misinformation has increased threats to our election systems and people. Violence has been threatened and appallingly used to intimidate and disrupt our elections.

This is totally unacceptable. We must ensure the security and integrity of our elections. Firearms have NO business in proximity to voting booths. I strongly urge this Committee to SUPPORT this bill!

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 9:18:09 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Michael A. Cobb Jr	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill because it infringes on my 2nd amendment rights to carry a weapon for self-defense. This will not stop criminals from threatening people at the polls. i should be able to carry my tools to vote. I need to protect myself and my family.

**LATE**

**SB-1030-SD-1**

Submitted on: 2/20/2025 10:58:52 PM

Testimony for JDC on 2/21/2025 10:20:00 AM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jacob Rathje	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I am writing my testimony in opposition of SB1030. This bill has far too many opportunities to be abused and misused to take legal action against someone who is not even close to attempting to break a law or intimidate someone. It is illegal for a citizen to use a firearm to intimidate someone for any reason. From my understanding, the simple possession of a concealed carry licensed firearm holder possessing a legally carried firearm in the vicinity of a place listed, would then be a criminal act. This bill now clarifies the distance a person cannot be in possession of a firearm add within 200ft. This is trivial and troublesome and goes against current concealed carry laws that allow firearms to be stored in a vehicle when entering an area where they are not allowed to be legally carried. It's already illegal to drive with a firearm to anywhere but an approved place in Hawai'i without a concealed carry license for that particular firearm. So this basically only is incriminating law abiding concealed carry license holders. These are not the criminals. This bill is unnecessary and unconstitutional as well. What if someone is legally carrying and a anti firearm group surrounds them? What if they are assaulted with a deadly weapon and are forced to use this legally licensed concealed carry firearm to protect the life of themselves or another and are within the determined distance of a voting station? They could be doing nothing to do with voting and be charged for criminal acts of election fraud as the result. I have never heard of a single voter intimidated with firearm in Hawai'i and I do not believe this is a genuinely needed Bill to pass into law. This is another form of intimidation against firearm owners to be told to keep in line and don't mess with the political party that threatens to destroy the second amendment. This state already is working to pass more unconditional laws and I feel this is a bill being pushed forward in order to remove more law abiding firearm owners from being able to own firearms in Hawai'i by making criminals out of law abiding firearm owners. This bill is not going to stop anything from happening if someone has bad intentions. Current laws already in place make it illegal to brandish or intimidate someone with a firearm in Hawai'i. This bill is unnecessary. Please vote No on SB1030.

Mahalo,