

# OFFICE OF INFORMATION PRACTICES

STATE OF HAWAII  
NO. 1 CAPITOL DISTRICT BUILDING  
250 SOUTH HOTEL STREET, SUITE 107  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813  
TELEPHONE: 808-586-1400 FAX: 808-586-1412  
EMAIL: oip@hawaii.gov

To: Senate Committee on Government Operations

From: Carlotta Amerino, Director

Date: February 5, 2026, 3:01 p.m.  
State Capitol, Conference Room 225

Re: Testimony on S.B. No. 3015  
Relating to Personal Information

---

---

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on this bill, which would (1) require government agencies to remove home addresses of government employees and officials and candidates and volunteers (collectively public servants) from their websites and all publicly available materials, (2) require members of the public requesting access to the home address of a public servant to identify themselves and provide several forms of contact information, and (3) allow public servants to object to the disclosure of their home address in response to a record request. The Office of Information Practices (OIP) offers comments about conflicts with the Uniform Information Practices Act (UIPA), chapter 92F, HRS.

Proposed section 92H-\_\_, HRS, beginning on page 2, requires each government agency to ensure that no home address of a public servant is publicly accessible, by removing the addresses from agency websites, online databases, publications, and any other public-facing information. A second proposed section beginning on page 3 clarifies that the public may still request access to a public servant's home address, but the request must include the requester's name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address, which will be provided to the public

servant, who can prevent disclosure by objecting. In other words, home addresses of public servants cannot be disclosed in response to a record request unless the public servant fails to object after receiving notice.

In most circumstances, an individual's home address may be withheld from public disclosure under the UIPA's privacy exception, section 92F-13(1), HRS, so treating the home address as confidential would be consistent with the UIPA. However, the UIPA mandates public disclosure without exception for “[l]and ownership, transfer, and lien records, including real property tax information and leases of state land.” HRS § 92F-12(a)(5). That information includes the owner (or lessee) name and property address. Many public servants are homeowners. Thus, there would always be a conflict between the proposed requirement that home addresses be confidential upon request, and the UIPA's existing requirement that property ownership information and property tax records be public without exception. The new law's confidentiality requirement would also conflict with the UIPA's mandate in section 92F-12(a), HRS, that home addresses be made public without exception for borrowers from state and county loan programs and (if the home address also serves as a business address) of persons holding licenses or permits, which may include public servants.

The requirement that a request for records that include a home address must include the requester's name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address also conflicts with the UIPA's existing “any person” standard for record requests: records are available to “any person” upon request under section 92F-11, HRS, so agencies cannot require requesters to identify themselves or explain why they need the records as a condition of fulfilling the request. This bill would require requesters to identify themselves, and provide contact information that not every requester necessarily has, whenever the requested records include a public

servant's home address, contrary to the UIPA's requirement that government records be disclosed (if no exception applies) upon request by "any person."

Depending on the time allowed for a public servant to object, the bill may also make it impossible for agencies to respond by the UIPA deadline of 10 business days after receipt to record requests that include home addresses.

To avoid conflicts with the UIPA, OIP respectfully recommends that this Committee amend this bill so that it does not apply to information mandated to be public under the UIPA. And because home addresses are either already subject to redaction under the UIPA's privacy exception, or public without exception under section 92F-12(a), HRS, it is unnecessary to set up a process for public servants to object to disclosure of a home address: either it can already be withheld, or withholding it would conflict with the UIPA's mandate that the address be disclosed. **OIP therefore recommends that this Committee delete** proposed section 92H-\_\_ from page 3, line 1, to page 4, line 2.

The UIPA applies to public record requests, and does not strictly require agencies to publish public information online or otherwise. Thus, barring agencies from proactively publishing public information does not violate the UIPA. Nonetheless, **if this Committee wishes to allow agency websites and publications to continue to publish and provide online access to public information**, rather than opening up an opportunity for third party businesses to profit by requesting and then reselling that same information, **OIP recommends that this Committee add "except to the extent the home address is required to be public under section 92F-12, HRS"** on page 2, to the end of line 14 and to the beginning of line 15.

Thank you for considering OIP's testimony.



STATE OF HAWAII  
CAMPAIGN SPENDING COMMISSION

235 SOUTH BERETANIA STREET, ROOM 300  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

February 3, 2026

TO: The Honorable Senator Angus L.K. McKelvey, Chair  
Senate Committee on Government Operations

The Honorable Mike Gabbard, Vice Chair  
Senate Committee on Government Operations

Members of the Senate Committee on Government Operations

FROM: Kristin Izumi-Nitao, Executive Director  
Campaign Spending Commission

KEN

SUBJECT: **Testimony on S.B. No. 3015, Relating to Personal Information.**  
Senate Committee on Government Operations  
Thursday, February 5, 2026, at 3:01 p.m.  
Conference Room 225 & Videoconference

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill. The Campaign Spending Commission (“Commission”) has strong concerns with the administration of this bill.

Hawaii campaign finance laws exist to provide transparency to the public relating to candidates, candidate committees, and noncandidate committees. In order to provide the public with transparency, Hawaii campaign finance laws require full disclosure of names and addresses of candidates, candidate committees, and contributors. This bill would require the Commission to redact information that is otherwise required by campaign finance law.

In addition, the Commission is concerned about the burden implementing this statute would place on Commission staff. Currently, the Commission has 5 staff members (and is in the process of hiring an investigator and another election assistant) who oversee 700+ committees. Depending on whether it is an election year, these 700+ committees file between 2-8 mandatory reports. Each report contains not only the home address of a candidate, but it may also contain the name and home address of “covered public servants” who make contributions to either a candidate, candidate committee, and/or noncandidate committee. The Commission staff would not be able to determine the names of “covered public servants” included on reports. In addition, the Commission does not have sufficient technology and resources to redact information of this magnitude within three business days under Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) §92H-2 or within ten additional business days under HRS §92H-4. If the Committee passes this bill, the Commission requests that the bill be amended to permit additional time for the Commission to comply with the statute depending on the volume of the redaction request.

Testimony of the Campaign Spending Commission  
Thirty-Third Legislature, 2026  
S.B. No. 3015, Relating to Personal Information.  
February 3, 2026  
Page 2

Lastly, Section 2 of this bill provides for what appears to be an administrative process to permit an individual to request the home address of a “covered public servant or candidate” which would then require Commission staff to notify the “covered public servant or candidate,” provide them with the individual/requestor’s contact information and a copy of their request. The “covered public servant or candidate” can then object by submitting a statement to the Commission that the disclosure would place them, a household member, or their property in imminent danger. While the Commission appreciates the intent of this bill, Section 2 speaks to decision-making process so far removed from the purpose of why this Commission exists, and thus, we have strong reservations regarding its implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our concerns.



**STATE OF HAWAII | KA MOKU'ĀINA 'O HAWAII**

**OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

**KA 'OIHANA PILI KĀLEPA**

335 MERCHANT STREET, ROOM 310

P.O. BOX 541

HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

Phone Number: 1-844-808-DCCA (3222)

Fax Number: (808) 586-2856

cca.hawaii.gov

**JOSH GREEN, M.D.**  
GOVERNOR | KE KIA'ĀINA

**SYLVIA LUKE**  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR | KA HOPE KIA'ĀINA

**NADINE Y. ANDO**  
DIRECTOR | KA LUNA HO'OKELE

**DEAN I HAZAMA**  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR | KA HOPE LUNA HO'OKELE

**Testimony of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs**

**Before the  
Senate Committee on Government Operations  
Thursday, February 5, 2026  
3:01 p.m.  
Via Videoconference**

**On the following measure:  
S.B. 3015, RELATING TO PERSONAL INFORMATION**

Chair McKelvey and Members of the Committee:

My name is Ty Nohara, and I am the Commissioner of Securities and head of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs' Business Registration Division (BREG). The Department offers comments on this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to limit public access to the home addresses of public servants and candidates for public office, by adding two new sections to Chapter 92H of the Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) to establish procedures for redaction, disclosure, and objection to disclosure. The new sections will: (1) require every government agency that maintains, uses, collects, or possesses the home address of a covered public servant or candidate to redact or remove such information from any publicly accessible source of information, including the agency's website, its online searchable database, and printed documents or publications that the agency has made publicly available; (2) allow an individual to request that an agency disclose a covered public servant or candidate's home address; and 3) provide a procedure for the covered public

servant or candidate to be notified of the request for disclosure and to object to such disclosure.

1. This bill amends HRS § 92H-1 by expanding the definition of a “covered public servant” to include a broad variety of individuals. This bill will also include a “candidate” for public office among the persons covered under HRS chapter 92H. However, this bill offers no guidance as to how a government agency may identify and determine all the persons who meet the new definition of a covered public servant and/or candidate, in order to remove and redact their home address(es), and to respond to a request for disclosure of the home address(es).
2. Further, HRS § 92H-1 currently defines “home” to mean “a permanent residence and any secondary residences affirmatively identified by the covered public servant but does not include a work address or investment property.”<sup>1</sup> (Emphasis added.) However, this bill is silent as to how an agency may determine whether a given address of the covered public servant or candidate (Subject) is that Subject’s “home address.” Without such direction, and unless the Subject affirmatively identifies their home address(es), the agency’s redaction or removal of an address may be inaccurate and/or based on guesswork. The Subject’s affirmative identification of a home address is especially necessary because this bill expands the persons to be covered under HRS chapter 92H, thereby increasing the burden of guesswork upon an agency, as well as the likelihood of error.
3. Section 92H-\_(b)(4) broadly requires an agency to “redact or otherwise remove home addresses from . . . [a]ny other publicly accessible source of information.” It is respectfully requested that this requirement be limited to those “other publicly accessible source of information” that is under the agency’s management and/or control.

---

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with the amendments contemplated by this bill, some of the definitions in HRS § 92H-1, and the pertinent provisions of HRS chapter 92H, will need to be amended to include the term “candidate.”

4. Assuming the agency is able to determine that a person is a Subject covered under HRS chapter 92H as amended, this bill allows an individual to submit a request to an agency for a Subject's home address, but requires the agency to first notify the Subject of the request and provide the individual's name, mailing address, telephone number, and electronic mailing address to the Subject. It is respectfully requested that this bill include language requiring the individual to provide this required information as part of the request for disclosure, so that the agency can, in turn, provide the required information to the Subject.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.



Senate Committee on Government Operations

Thursday, February 5, 2026, 3:01 PM Hearing in Conference Room 225 on  
SB 3015, Relating to Personal Information

TESTIMONY

Douglas Meller, Legislative Committee, League of Women Voters of Hawaii

Chair McKelvey, Vice Chair Gabbard, and Committee Members:

**The League of Women Voters of Hawaii is concerned about whether SB 3015 might unintentionally conflict with other laws that require public disclosure of addresses.** For example, addresses must be disclosed for candidate nomination papers, petitions to place proposals on a county ballot, real property tax information, state and county loans, leases of state land, etc.



Feb. 5, 2026

Sen. Angus L.K. McKelvey  
Senate Government Operations Committee  
State Capitol  
Honolulu, HI

Senate Bill 3015

Chairman McKelvey and Committee Members:

We do not oppose this bill outright, but do have serious questions about the limitation on the news media's ability to report about whether candidates live in the districts they want to represent.

This bill would slow down the process of reviewing a candidate or candidates especially after reapportionment, but we ask you to come up with a provision that prevents a candidate from objecting to disclosure of his or her home address when residency status for a particular election district is questioned. The same could be raised about a voter voting in a district in which he or she does not live.

We understand the push for privacy given our divided political climate, but safeguards must be in place to help ensure a democratic society.

Thank you,

Stirling Morita  
President  
Hawaii Professional Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists



**TESTIMONY OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
KA 'OIHANA O KA LOIO KUHINA  
THIRTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE, 2026**

**LATE**

**ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:  
S.B. NO. 3015, RELATING TO PERSONAL INFORMATION.**

**BEFORE THE:  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS**

**DATE:** Thursday, February 5, 2026      **TIME:** 3:01 p.m.

**LOCATION:** State Capitol, Room 225

**TESTIFIER(S):** Anne E. Lopez, Attorney General, or  
Jung Min (Charles) Lee, Deputy Attorney General

---

Chair McKelvey and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General offers the following comments.

As drafted, the bill requires every government agency that maintains a covered person's home address to "ensure that the home address is not publicly accessible", and mandates removal or redaction from agency websites, searchable databases, publications, and "any other publicly accessible source of information".

The intent of the bill is appreciated, but implementation may be difficult as written. Although agencies can reduce routine publication of home addresses in agency-controlled systems, the bill's absolute "ensure" standard—particularly when paired with the open-ended "any other publicly accessible source" wording—may be difficult to implement consistently or satisfy in full, especially for legacy materials, archived publications, and information that may be republished outside an agency's control. These ambiguities increase the risk of uneven compliance and disputes over whether an agency has met an obligation framed in categorical terms.

To support implementation and enforcement, the Legislature may wish to clarify the scope and standard of compliance. For example, the bill could: (1) define "publicly accessible" at page 2, line 14, and "publicly accessible source of information" at page 2, line 21, and limit the duty to records, databases, and publications that are created, maintained, or controlled by the agency; (2) replace "ensure" at page 2, line 13, with an administrable standard such as "make reasonable efforts" or "take reasonable

Testimony of the Department of the Attorney General

Thirty-Third Legislature, 2026

Page 2 of 2

steps", coupled with illustrative minimum actions (e.g., remove from agency web pages and searchable databases, redact in routinely posted reports, and update templates/forms); (3) address legacy content by allowing a phased approach—such as requiring removal from current systems by a date certain and remediation of archival materials upon request or as resources permit; (4) include a realistic delayed effective date or transition period to allow agencies to inventory systems, update policies, and coordinate with IT and record custodians; and (5) clarify how the new requirements interact with chapter 92F, Hawaii Revised Statutes, to ensure consistent handling when home addresses appear within records requested under the Uniform Information Practices Act. These amendments would preserve the bill's protective purpose while providing agencies with a measurable, enforceable standard that can be applied uniformly across state and county government.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

LATE



Senate Committee on Government Operations  
Honorable Angus L.K. McKelvey, Chair  
Honorable Mike Gabbard, Vice Chair

**RE: Testimony in Opposition to S.B. 3015, Relating to Personal Information**  
Hearing: February 5, 2026 at 3:01 p.m.

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee:

My name is Ben Creps. I am a staff attorney at the Public First Law Center, a nonprofit organization that promotes government transparency. Thank you for the opportunity to respectfully submit testimony in **opposition** to S.B. 3015.

In 2024, the Legislature passed Act 187, which created Hawai`i Revised Statutes chapter 92H. Act 187 was the result of input from numerous competing interests. The final product represented a compromise that furthered the intent of protecting the personal information of judges and other high-level government employees, while preserving the public's right to access government records. S.B. 3015, however, upends that careful balance.

We strongly support the intent to protect personal information from being used to harass or threaten individuals. This protection, however, should not be limited to just government officials, as proposed here. It should be afforded to everyone.

The new substantive provisions, however, are unnecessary to protect personal information. Existing law already provides robust public records exemptions that address the intent of S.B. 3015 to protect home addresses. *E.g.*, HRS § 92F-13; HRS § 92F-14(b)(10); OIP Op. No 07-07 (DLNR may withhold home addresses); OIP Op. No. 04-04 (county clerk may withhold home addresses of voter petition signatories); OIP 99-02 (county police may withhold home addresses in police report). Protected personal information is not being disclosed through public record disclosures. *E.g.*, [https://techpolicy.sanford.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/07/Sherman-Justin\\_WrittenTestimony\\_MA\\_Legislature.pdf](https://techpolicy.sanford.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/07/Sherman-Justin_WrittenTestimony_MA_Legislature.pdf) (highlighting role of data brokers who scrape personal information from mobile apps and credit applications, as well as other commercially available people search services).

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify in opposition to S.B. 3015.

