

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR
KE KIA'ĀINA



STATE OF HAWAII
KA MOKU'ĀINA O HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
KA 'OIHANA PILI KAUA
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL
3949 DIAMOND HEAD ROAD
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96816-4495

STEPHEN F. LOGAN
MAJOR GENERAL
ADJUTANT GENERAL
KA 'AKUKANA KENELALA
PHILLIP L. MALLORY III
BRIGADIER GENERAL
DEPUTY ADJUTANT GENERAL
KA HOPE 'AKUKANA KENELALA

TESTIMONY ON SENATE BILL 2054 SD2 HD1
RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY
BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY & HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

BY

BRIGADIER GENERAL WALTER R. ROSS, JR.
DIRECTOR
JOINT STAFF, HAWAII NATIONAL GUARD

March 23, 2026

Aloha Chair Tarnas and Vice-Chair Poepoe, and Members of the Committee:

I am Brigadier General Walter Ross, Director of the Joint Staff, Hawaii National Guard, State of Hawaii, Department of Defense.

I am presenting this testimony in **OPPOSITION** to SB2054 SD2 HD1.

The primary objective of this legislation is to prevent the Hawaii National Guard from being deployed to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement agencies, or National Guard units from other states operating within Hawaii, particularly when the Governor opposes the deployment.

Should SB2054 SD2 HD1 be enacted, it would create a complex and potentially precarious situation for Hawaii National Guard Commanders and service members, exposing them to significant legal risks. These risks could manifest as both state and federal criminal liability. The dilemma arises from the legal obligation for service members to obey orders from their superiors, which stands in stark contrast to the possibility of being held accountable for those orders if they are later determined to be unlawful. For example, in recent instances of federal activations of Guardsmen pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 12406, service members complied with the directives issued to them, even as several states sought legal remedies to challenge the orders through lawsuits. Ultimately, the Supreme Court ruled that the federal activations were improper or illegal under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. § 12406. However, it is important to highlight that this critical ruling was issued only after the Guardsmen had already executed the orders they were given, thereby placing them at substantial legal risk. Thus, SB2054 SD2 HD1 could similarly expose our Hawaii Guardsmen to state criminal liability in parallel circumstances where the legality of their actions is subsequently challenged.

Moreover, it is crucial to consider the President's role as Commander in Chief, who is vested with the authority to deploy Title 10 forces to enforce federal law under the auspices of the Federal Insurrection Act, found in 10 U.S.C. §§ 251-255. Historically, this act has been invoked by various presidential administrations, especially during pivotal national crises, such as the Civil Rights Era. During these tumultuous years, Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson invoked the Insurrection Act to deploy troops to enforce desegregation laws in Southern states. Frequently, these military deployments occurred despite strong vocal opposition from state governors and local elected officials. Notably, the military call-ups associated with the Insurrection Act were never successfully challenged in court as unlawful. However, if a state were to mount a successful legal challenge against the federal administration's actions regarding such a deployment, it could once again place our Guardsmen in a vulnerable position, exposing them to potential scrutiny and prosecution by state or federal authorities, contingent on the Supreme Court's prevailing interpretations.

In light of these substantial legal and ethical implications, I strongly urge you to consider the myriad potential consequences that the passage of SB2054 SD2 HD1 may have, not only for the Commanders and members of the Hawai'i National Guard but also for the broader governance landscape. This legislation has the potential to alter the operational dynamics of the Hawai'i National Guard, heightening uncertainty about the legal parameters within which they operate. Additionally, it warrants a thorough examination of the broader implications this bill could entail for the delicate balance of power and the relationship between state authority and federal governance. The potential passage of SB2054 SD2 HD1 could fundamentally challenge the operational readiness of the Hawai'i National Guard and may reverberate through the intricate web of state-federal relations.

For these reasons, I humbly ask for you to oppose this measure.

Brigadier General Walter R. Ross, Jr., walter.r.ross2.mil@army.mil; 808-844-6087



OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

‘Ōlelo Hō‘ike ‘Aha Kau Kānāwai

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 2054 SD2 HD1

RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY

Ke Kōmike Hale o ka Ho‘okolokolo a me ke Kuleana Hawai‘i

(House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs)

Ke Kapitala ‘o Hawai‘i

(Hawai‘i State Capitol)

Malaki 25, 2026

2:00 PM

Lumi 325

Aloha e Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Members of the House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs:

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) **SUPPORTS SB2054 SD2 HD1** which prohibits the commanding officer of any unit of the armed forces of this State called into active service pursuant to state law or title 32 United States Code from assisting or cooperating with, or allowing time, money, personnel, data, or other resources to be used to assist, cooperate with, or facilitate, certain operations by federal troops, federal law enforcement, or another state’s National Guard in Hawai‘i when the Governor has objected to the deployment. OHA appreciates the recent amendments requiring any gubernatorial objection to be made in writing, clearly identify the deployment or operation at issue, state the factual basis, define its scope and duration, be provided to relevant state officials, and be maintained as a public record subject to confidentiality requirements.

OHA supports measures preserving clear lines of state authority, democratic accountability, and community trust in the use of military and law enforcement resources within Hawai‘i. The amendments in this measure strengthen that framework by ensuring any gubernatorial objection is formal, transparent, and administratively clear. That specificity supports sound governance and provides needed notice to officials responsible for implementation.

For Native Hawaiian communities and other populations with histories of over-policing, displacement, and militarization, clarity and restraint in the use of armed forces in civilian contexts carry particular importance. Hawai‘i’s history, including the overthrow and the long legacy of militarization, gives these questions special weight here. When military resources are used in civilian settings without clear local accountability, public trust can be deeply harmed, especially among Kānaka Maoli.

This bill does not interfere with actions required by federal or state law, nor does it limit the Guard’s role in disaster response or true emergencies. Rather, it establishes a guardrail against discretionary assistance to outside deployments lacking the consent of

Hawai'i's elected state leadership. In doing so, it helps ensure public safety operations involving military resources remain transparent, narrowly controlled, and accountable to the people of Hawai'i.

For these reasons, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs respectfully urges this Committee to **PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1**. Mahalo nui for the opportunity to provide testimony on this important measure.

COMMUNITY ALLIANCE ON PRISONS

P.O. Box 37158, Honolulu, HI 96837-0158

Phone/E-Mail: [\(808\) 927-1214](tel:(808)927-1214) / kat.caphi@gmail.com

Today's Inmate; Tomorrow's Neighbor



COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY & HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

Representative David Tarnas, Chair

Representative Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

2:00 PM

Room 325 and VIDEOCONFERENCE

STRONG SUPPORT FOR SB2054 SD2, HD1 - HAWAII NATIONAL GUARD DEPLOYMENT

Aloha Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe and Members of the Committee!

My name is Kat Brady and I am the Coordinator of Community Alliance on Prisons, a community initiative promoting smart justice policies in Hawai'i for almost three decades. This testimony is respectfully offered on behalf of the 3,633 Hawai'i individuals living behind bars¹ and under the "care and custody" of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation on March 16, 2026. We are always mindful that 797 of Hawai'i's imprisoned male population are serving their sentences abroad -- thousands of miles away from their loved ones, their homes and, for the disproportionate number of incarcerated Kanaka Maoli, far, far from their ancestral lands.

¹ DCR Weekly Population Report, March 16, 2026

[Pop-Reports-Weekly-2026-03-16.pdf](#)

² Grading the States: The State Compassionate Release Report Card Project, FMM. October 2022.

<https://famm.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/compassionate-release-report.pdf>

Community Alliance on Prisons appreciates the opportunity to express our **STRONG SUPPORT FOR SB2054 SD2, HD1** clarifies that when the Governor objects to a federal or out-of-state deployment, Hawai`i's National Guard may not provide personnel, equipment, or logistical support for that operation. The amendments provide a clearer implementation framework, specifying that the Governor's objection must be made through a written determination that identifies the factual basis, scope, and duration of the objection. Effective 7/1/3000. (HD1)

We are proud that our Governor has been very clear about how our state resources are used and we urge the committee to support this SB 2054 SD2, HD1! Our National Guard are needed now as our islands and people are inundated with massive rainstorms. The Hawai`i National Guard is needed for this disaster that the Governor estimates will cost at least \$1,000,000,000 in damages to homes and infrastructure.

Mahalo for this opportunity to share our beliefs in how our hard-earned tax dollars and personnel are used.



**TESTIMONY ON SB 2054 SD2 HD1
RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY**

Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs
Representative David Tarnas, Chair
Representative Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Wednesday, March 25, 2026 at 2:00 PM
Conference Room 325 or via Videoconference

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Members of the Committee:

The Hawaii Military Affairs Council ("MAC") offers comments on SB 2054 SD2 HD1.

The MAC was established in 1985 when the Chamber was appointed by the State to serve as the liaison to the military. The MAC advocates on behalf of Hawaii's military, and is comprised of business leaders, academic institutions, State and County officials, members of the CODEL, community leaders, labor unions and organizations and retired U.S. flag and general officers. The MAC works to support Hawaii's location as a strategic U.S. headquarters in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region which is crucial for U.S. national and homeland security.

This is an emotional and sensitive issue, not only for Hawai'i but for cities and states across the nation that are grappling with questions about the proper balance of state authority, federal authority, and the role of the National Guard. These debates touch on constitutional boundaries, community trust, and the real-world consequences for the men and women who serve.

While we appreciate the intent of this measure, if enacted, SB 2054 SD2 HD1 could place Hawai'i National Guardsmen and women in an impossible position. If federal authorities activate the Guard under existing federal law, service members are legally obligated to follow those orders. SB 2054 SD2 HD1, however, creates the possibility that the State could later determine those actions were unlawful, thus exposing Guardsmen and women to state criminal liability.

Hawai'i hosts the Indo-Pacific's most critical military commands. The Guard plays a key role in that ecosystem—supporting federal missions, responding to emergencies, and serving as a bridge between state and federal authorities.



The Governor already controls whether Hawai'i National Guard forces are deployed under state authority. What the Governor cannot do and what SB 2054 SD2 HD1 attempts to change is override federal authority when the Guard is federalized. But that is a constitutional issue, not a statutory one, and should not be altered by state legislation.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.



Cade Watanabe, Financial Secretary-Treasurer

Gemma G. Weinstein, President

Eric W. Gill, Senior Vice-President

March 23, 2026

House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs
Rep. David Tarnas, Chair
Rep. Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Testimony in Strong Support of SB 2054

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Committee Members:

UNITE HERE Local 5 represents over 10,000 working people in the hotel, food service and health care industries across Hawaii. The experiences of our sister locals elsewhere in the U.S., including Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and Washington DC, make clear to us that it is necessary to take action to rein in ICE and DHS across the country.

We do not want our union members, their families, or anyone else in our community to be targeted, terrorized, assaulted, kidnapped, or killed by government agents or anyone else. We do not want their rights to be violated. All people should be treated with respect and dignity.

We urge your support of SB 2054. This measure is an important step toward greater accountability and safeguarding the most vulnerable people in our community.

Thank you.



MARCH 25, 2026

SENATE BILL 2054 SD2 HD1

CURRENT REFERRAL: JHA

808-679-7454
kris@imuaalliance.org
www.imuaalliance.org
@imuaalliance

Kris Coffield,
President

David Negaard,
Director

Mireille Ellsworth,
Director

Justin Salisbury,
Director

Eileen Roco,
Director

Beatrice DeRego,
Director

Corey Rosenlee,
Director

Amy Zhao,
*Policy and Partnerships
Strategist*

POSITION: SUPPORT

Imua Alliance supports SB 2054 SD2 HD1, relating to public safety, which prohibits the Hawai‘i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai‘i when the Governor has objected to the deployments.

Imua Alliance is a Hawai‘i-based organization dedicated to ending sexual exploitation and gender-based violence, and ensuring survivors—regardless of immigration status—can access safety, services, and justice. Many victims of exploitation in the islands are migrants. To ensure their path to safety from sexual and gender harm, we must defend their fundamental rights.

This measure is an important safeguard that protects Hawai‘i’s civil liberties and community safety by ensuring that military forces are not used in ways that undermine civilian governance or local oversight. Across the United States, the use of National Guard troops in domestic law enforcement contexts has increased in recent years, especially regarding enhanced immigration enforcement and political protests.

While the National Guard plays a vital role in disaster response and emergency management, deployments involving civil unrest, immigration enforcement, or federal policing actions have raised serious legal and civil rights concerns. In several recent instances, federal deployments of military forces into civilian contexts have prompted legal challenges and court scrutiny. Courts have reaffirmed the longstanding principle that military forces should

not be used as a substitute for civilian law enforcement except in the most extreme circumstances.

This principle is embedded in the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878, which generally prohibits federal military forces from executing domestic laws unless expressly authorized by Congress. The law reflects a core democratic safeguard: the prevention of military involvement in routine civilian policing. Legal scholars and civil rights organizations have increasingly warned that the growing use of military forces in domestic enforcement roles risks escalating tensions during protests, increasing the likelihood of violence, and eroding public trust in government institutions.

The constitutional relationship between the states and the federal government with respect to the National Guard is complex, but deliberate. The National Guard operates under a dual state-federal structure, meaning it can serve both state missions under the Governor and federal missions under presidential authority. In *Perpich v. Department of Defense* (1990), the United States Supreme Court affirmed that the National Guard maintains this dual status, recognizing both the federal government's authority to activate National Guard units and the historic role of state militias under state leadership.

This structure reflects the framers' concern about centralized military power and their intent to preserve meaningful state oversight over militia forces. Measures like this reinforce that balance by ensuring Hawai'i's National Guard cannot be used to facilitate federal operations in the State when the Governor has determined such deployments are inappropriate or countervail the regular administration of peace or public safety.

The importance of protecting state sovereignty is especially significant in Hawai'i. The islands have a long and complicated history involving military authority and federal intervention. In 1893, the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom was supported by U.S. military forces, demonstrating how military involvement in political affairs can have profound and lasting consequences for democratic governance and indigenous sovereignty. Later, during World War II, Hawai'i was placed under martial law for nearly three years, with civilian courts suspended and military authorities exercising broad control over civilian life.

These historical experiences serve as powerful reminders of why clear boundaries between military power and civilian governance remain essential. Today, Hawai‘i continues to host one of the largest concentrations of U.S. military installations in the world relative to its population. While the military plays an important role in disaster response, this reality also underscores the need for strong protections ensuring that military forces are not used in ways that undermine local authority or civil rights.

Across the country, immigrant communities have reported increased fear when militarized enforcement operations occur in their neighborhoods. This dynamic can undermine public safety by eroding trust between residents and public institutions. By ensuring that Hawai‘i’s National Guard cannot be compelled to support federal deployments that the Governor has opposed, this proposal preserves community trust and reinforces the principle that public safety in Hawai‘i should remain grounded in civilian institutions accountable to the people of this State.

At a time when domestic deployments of military forces are increasingly contested across the country, this measure ensures that Hawai‘i maintains clear oversight of how military resources within the State may be used.

With aloha,

Kris Coffield

President, Imua Alliance



TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SB2054, SD2, HD1 - RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY

House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs

Rep. David Tarnas, Chair

Rep. Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Hearing Date: March 25, 2026 | Letter Date: March 24, 2026

Dear Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Members of the Committees:

The Legal Clinic (TLC) supports SB2054, SD2, HD1 which prohibits the Hawai'i National Guard from assisting or cooperating with federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the National Guard of another state operating in Hawai'i when the Governor has objected to those deployments.

As a nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing immigrant justice in Hawai'i, TLC supports due process, fair and accountable public safety institutions, and policies that strengthen public trust. SB2054, SD2, HD1 advances these principles by reinforcing democratic accountability and state rights, ensuring that state resources are applied in ways consistent with the priorities of Hawai'i's elected leadership and communities.

SB2054, SD2, HD1 clarifies that when the Governor objects to a federal or out-of-state deployment, Hawai'i's National Guard may not provide personnel, data, or other resources for that operation. The amendments made to this measure provide a clearer implementation framework, specifying that the Governor's objection must be made through a written determination that identifies the factual basis, scope, and duration of the objection.

SB2054, SD2 preserves the Guard's primary role in serving Hawai'i's safety and emergency needs and prevents the diversion of state resources to contested operations that undermine community trust. The importance of this clarity is underscored by recent alarming efforts by the Trump administration to federalize and deploy National Guard units in other states where the Governors publicly rejected those deployments, including California, Illinois, and Oregon. When large-scale federal deployments occur without the consent of state leaders, they can create fear and instability in local communities – especially among immigrant communities and people of color.

SB2054, SD2 draws a clear bright line: when Hawai'i's Governor objects to a deployment, Hawai'i's National Guard cannot be used to support that operation. We urge the Committee to pass this important measure.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of The Legal Clinic
and Board President Amefil Agbayani,

Christina Sablan

Community & Policy Advocate

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 8:22:32 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Yvette Kay	Kona Indivisible & Matriarchy Rising	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

1. Codifies the Governor’s authority as commander-in-chief of the state Guard when not federalized — this is already the constitutional structure; the bill puts it in enforceable statute.
2. Prevents state military resources from being used for federal deployments Hawai’i has objected to — including civil immigration enforcement operations that threaten immigrant and mixed-status communities.
3. Narrowly tailored: carve-out for legally required assistance preserves core constitutional functions without undermining the protection.
4.]Consistent with national trend: multiple states are pursuing similar Guard sovereignty protections in response to federal deployment overreach. Courts have repeatedly found some federal deployments illegal.
5.]JHA perspective: this bill reinforces constitutional order, civil liberties, and community safety — exactly the areas where JHA leadership has made a difference this session.
6. Passed House PBS and now advances to JHA — one step from Finance and final passage.

My name is Yvette Kay and I am a resident of Kailua Kona in Hawai'i County. I am on the leadership team for Kona Indivisible and run the protest arm of Kona Indivisible named, Matriarchy Rising. I support this bill.

yvettekay_99@yahoo.com

96740

415-706-9638



Testimony in Strong Support of SB2054 – Critical Amendments Needed

Aloha Chair and Committee members,



The Libertarian Party of Hawaii stands in strong support of SB2054. We will back the bill whether or not our suggested amendments are adopted, but we firmly believe there are a couple of changes that could be made to strengthen the purpose and scope of the bill.

Hawaii Sovereignty

This bill is a necessary step to protect Hawaii’s sovereignty. It amends HRS §121-30 to bar Hawaii National Guard units under state control or Title 32 duty from assisting, cooperating with, or handing resources over to federal troops, federal law enforcement, or out-of-state Guard forces here in Hawaii when the Governor objects. That core protection is real progress and aligns directly with constitutional limits on federal power. It **does not** create any new state programs, hire staff, buy equipment, or require ongoing spending.

Newsom v. Trump

Recent events prove why we must strengthen the measure. In June 2025, President Trump federalized thousands of California National Guard troops and sent them into Los Angeles against Governor Newsom’s explicit objections. What followed was exactly the kind of federal overreach the Founders feared: armed troops on city streets clashing with protesters amid immigration enforcement operations.

U.S. District Judge Charles R. Breyer didn’t mince words in *Newsom v. Trump* (N.D. Cal. 3:25-cv-04870). In his December 10, 2025 order granting a preliminary injunction, he ruled the continued federalization **under 10 U.S.C. §12406** unlawful, ordered control of the remaining Guard members returned to the Governor, and warned that the federal position would allow any president to create a “*perpetual police force*” made up of state troops. The court emphasized that such an interpretation would “*wholly upend the federalism that is at the heart of our system of government*” and revive the Founders’ deepest fears of a standing army. The ruling repeatedly invoked the Tenth Amendment, affirming that the National Guard remains a state militia under state control unless narrow enumerated federal powers are properly exercised. The case was a live demonstration of the precise danger Hawaii faces.



Targeted Amendments

To fully achieve SB2054's goal of protecting state sovereignty, we recommend the Committee add the following wording:

A. **Add the following definition** to the definitions section:

“Federal deployment” means any activation of the Hawaii National Guard under Title 10 or Title 32 of the United States Code, including in-state or out-of-state missions which are executed by or under federal authority.

B. **Add the following core restriction** as a new subsection in the operative provisions (right after the current language on HRS §121-30):

No unit or member of the Hawaii National Guard shall be deployed for federal service, whether in-state or out-of-state, under Title 10 or Title 32 of the United States Code, unless: The U.S. Federal Government provides constitutional authorization; or The Governor of Hawaii provides express written consent, following consultation with the Hawaii State Legislature.

Amendments Are Better — But We Support the Bill Either Way

We believe these amendments are absolutely the stronger option because they best fulfill the goal and intent of the bill by preventing our Guard from ever being turned into a president's toy soldiers on Hawaiian soil. That said, the Libertarian Party of Hawaii supports SB2054 either way. Even in its current form, it is a meaningful step forward that reinforces state control and deserves passage.

We respectfully urge the Committee to insert the language quoted above. Strengthen the bill if possible, but pass it regardless. Hawaii needs this protection now.

Defend Hawaii, or Lose it.

Mahalo for your time and for standing up for our sovereignty. The Libertarian Party of Hawaii stands ready to answer any questions or provide additional constitutional analysis.

For Liberty,

Abbra Green | LPHI Secretary | LibertarianHawaii.com | (808)824-LPHI



Testimony in Strong Support of SB2054, HD1 – The Defend Hawaii Act

House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs (JHA)

Hearing: Wednesday, March 25, 2026, 2:00 p.m. — Submitted by: Austin Martin

Original Author and Proposer of SB2054, the Defend Hawaii Act

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair(s), and distinguished members of the JHA Committee:

Aloha. My name is Austin Martin. I am the original author and proposer of SB2054, the Defend Hawaii Act. I appear before you today not only as an architect but as a proud Hawaiian committed to safeguarding our state’s sovereignty, our National Guard, and the constitutional design of our republic. I strongly urge you to pass SB2054, SD2, HD1 without further weakening amendments. This measure is simple, targeted, and essential. It amends HRS §121-30 to prohibit Hawaii National Guard units—when operating under state control or Title 32 status—from assisting, cooperating with, or providing resources to federal troops, federal law enforcement, or out-of-state National Guard forces deployed within Hawaii if the Governor objects. A narrow carve-out preserves compliance with any truly required federal or state law. Nothing more, nothing less.

This language directly addresses the core problem we have witnessed in real time. The recent *Newsom v. Trump* litigation in California exposed how federal administrations can attempt to federalize or commandeer National Guard assets for domestic operations—even over a governor’s objection—under statutes like 10 U.S.C. §12406. Hawaii must not wait for a similar crisis on our soil. SB2054 places a clear, procedural safeguard in state law so that our Guard cannot be drawn into adverse domestic deployments against the expressed will of Hawaii’s chief executive. The bill respects every relevant U.S. Supreme Court precedent on federalization while leaning into an originalist understanding of the Second Amendment’s Militia Clause. The Framers designed the militia as a state-controlled force “necessary to the security of a free State”—not as a federal instrument for politically controversial operations on American soil. By



codifying the Governor’s check at the state level, SB2054 creates a clean statutory record that will support that original constitutional meaning of the 2nd Amendment if ever tested in court.

Critically, this legislation imposes zero new costs on the State of Hawaii. It requires no additional appropriations, no new bureaucracy, and no expansion of state programs. It is a pure limitation on misuse—nothing more. It also poses no risk to federal funding. The Guard’s Title 10 and Title 32 funding streams remain untouched; the bill only governs in-state assistance when the Governor has already objected. Federal dollars for legitimate training, disaster response, and overseas missions continue without interruption.

Opponents may raise “readiness” concerns. That objection does not withstand scrutiny. The Governor’s check will almost never arise in true combat deployments or genuine emergencies. It will arise, if at all, in the narrow class of politically charged domestic disputes where rapid federal deployment is itself the controversy. In those scenarios, a brief procedural safeguard—or even judicial review—protects the public interest far more than it harms readiness. Hawaii’s Guard exists first and foremost to defend Hawaii. Keeping it available for hurricanes, floods, and local security is the highest form of readiness, not the lowest.

We have already seen discussions about reinforcing Title 32 protections in light of the California precedent. If the Committee wishes to make that protection even more explicit, I stand ready to assist. The original vision of SB2054 included measured gubernatorial checks on both Title 32 and Title 10 deployments; the narrower focus of the present bill remains a pragmatic and constitutional step forward. I respectfully suggest maintaining these original elements to strengthen and balance this bill:

Suggested Targeted Amendments

To fully achieve SB2054’s goal of protecting state sovereignty, we recommend the Committee add the following exact wording in two places:

1. Add the following definition to the definitions section:

- a. *“Federal deployment” means any activation of the Hawaii National Guard under Title 10 or Title 32 of the United States Code, including in-state or out-of-state missions which are executed by or under federal authority.”*
2. Add the following core restriction as a new subsection in the operative provisions (right after the current language on HRS §121-30):
 - a. *“No unit or member of the Hawaii National Guard shall be deployed for federal service, whether in-state or out-of-state, under Title 10 or Title 32 of the United States Code, unless:
 - i. *“The U.S. Federal Government provides constitutional authorization; or The Governor of Hawaii provides express written consent, following consultation with the Hawaii State Legislature.”**

These targeted additions form the constitutional backbone that turns a procedural measure into a robust shield. Chair Tarnas and members, SB2054 is not radical. It is restorative. It restores the constitutional balance the Framers intended between federal and state authority over the militia. It protects our Guard from being commandeered into missions that Hawai‘i’s elected leadership has already rejected. And it does so at no cost, with no risk to federal funding, and without impairing legitimate national defense. I respectfully ask for your “Ayes” on SB2054, HD1. Let us send a clear message: Hawaii will defend Hawaii.

Mahalo nui loa for your time and service. I am happy to answer any questions.



Respectfully submitted,

Austin Martin

Libertarian Party of Hawaii — State Chair

Libertarian National Committee — Region 1 Member

Original Author and Proposer, SB2054 – Defend Hawaii Act

**Testimony of Megahn Chun and Alejandro Villarino
In SUPPORT of SB2054 SD2 HD1**

Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Representative David A. Tarnas, Chair
Representative Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Hearing Date: March 25, 2026

Dear Chair David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair Mahina Poepoe, and members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

Our names are Megahn Chun and Alejandro Villarino, and we submit this testimony in **support of SB2054 SD2 HD1**, which prohibits the Hawai‘i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai‘i when the Governor has objected to those deployments, with a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

Mercado de la Raza is a community-driven Latin market in Hawai‘i that serves as a hub for Latino and immigrant entrepreneurs, families, and cultural exchange. Through small business support, community programming, and accessible resources, Mercado de la Raza works to uplift historically underserved communities and create pathways to economic stability, safety, and belonging. In our daily work, we are in direct relationship with immigrant families whose well-being is deeply impacted by state policies, and we are committed to advocating for initiatives like these that promote equity, protection, and opportunity for our community.

The Governor serves as commander-in-chief of the Hawai‘i National Guard under state control. SB2054 SD2 HD1 codifies that authority by ensuring state military resources cannot be used to support federal deployments that Hawai‘i has not consented to. As federal military and law enforcement deployments to states have increased — many challenged in courts as illegal, and several found to violate the law — it is essential that Hawai‘i have clear statutory guardrails that protect our state’s sovereignty and its ability to define its own public safety priorities.

This bill also matters for community trust and safety. Immigrant and mixed-status families should not fear that state Guard forces will be mobilized against them in civil immigration operations. The bill is narrowly tailored — it includes a carve-out for legally required assistance — and it has already passed House PBS. The Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs, which has been the leading force for civil rights and constitutional protections this session, is well-positioned to advance this state sovereignty protection toward Finance and final passage.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Committee **PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1**. Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Sincerely,
Megahn Chun and Alejandro Villarino
Mercado de la Raza
808.593.2226



Committee: Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs
Hearing Date/Time: Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 2:00pm
Place: Conference Room 325 & Videoconference
Re: **Testimony of the ACLU of Hawai'i in SUPPORT of SB2054 SD2 HD1, Relating to Public Safety**

Dear Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Committee Members:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Hawai'i (ACLU-HI) writes in **support of SB2054 SD2 HD1**, which would prohibit the Hawai'i National Guard from being commandeered to serve federal operations that run counter to the safety and interests of Hawai'i's communities.

Throughout the continent, we have witnessed President Trump deploy troops and militarized federal agents into cities to scare our communities.¹ This blending of law enforcement agencies with military units in a single deportation force is a recipe for the abuse of civil rights – including excessive use of force, racial profiling, and illegal detention.

In Hawai'i, we have seen federal agents taking our immigrant neighbors.² Immigration enforcement has spiked in Hawai'i as compared to previous years: between January 20, 2025 and October 15, 2025, detainers nearly doubled, administrative arrests more than tripled, and detention stays nearly tripled, as compared to the same period in 2024.³ We know that throughout the country, most people being held in detention have not been convicted of a crime.⁴

We must prevent our local authorities, including the Hawai'i National Guard, from being co-opted into federal law enforcement operations that are ripping our neighbors away from their families and hurting our communities. Our state and local policies

¹ Planas R and Witherspoon A. (2026, January 28). The federal agents deployed in Trump's immigration crackdown – visualized. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/jan/19/donald-trump-immigration-crackdown>

² Leonard, M. (2026, January 6). Hawai'i ICE arrests and detentions in 2025 spiked from year before. Honolulu Civil Beat. <https://www.civilbeat.org/2026/01/hawaii-ice-arrests-detentions-2025-far-exceed-2024/>

³ Hausman, D. (2025). "U.S. immigration enforcement data." California Law Review Online, 16 (13).

⁴ Hausman, D. (2025).

should ensure our law enforcement agencies do not support this gross federal overreach.

It is our kuleana to protect our neighbors' rights to live without fear. For the above reasons, we respectfully request that you pass SB2054 SD2 HD1.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

Mandy Fernandes
Policy Director
ACLU of Hawai'i

With more than 4,000 Hawai'i-based members, the mission of the American Civil Liberties Union of Hawai'i is to protect the fundamental freedoms enshrined in the United States and Hawai'i State Constitutions through legislative, litigation, and public education work. The ACLU of Hawai'i is a non-partisan and private non-profit organization that provides its services at no cost to the public and does not accept government funds. The ACLU of Hawai'i has been serving our communities in Hawai'i for over 60 years.



COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY & HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

Rep. David A. Tarnas, Chair

Rep. Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

HEARING:

Wednesday, March 25, 2026 at 2:00 pm, Videoconference and Conference Room 325

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SB 2054, SD2, HD1 - RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY.

Aloha Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Members of the Committee,

My name is Veronica Mendoza, Founding Executive Director of Roots Reborn and a founding coalition member of El Pueblo en Acción (EPA) Maui — *The People in Action Maui*. I am writing in **strong support of SB 2054, SD2, HD1**, which prohibits the Hawaii National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawaii when the governor has objected to the deployments.

Roots Reborn is a grassroots, multicultural immigrant-justice and disaster-response organization serving migrant and immigrant communities on Maui and beyond. Born out of the August 2023 wildfires, we immediately stepped in to move aid, navigate systems alongside families, and build the trusted relationships that still anchor our work today. What began as wildfire response has grown into essential infrastructure for immigrant communities facing overlapping crises—from recovery and housing instability to shifting federal policies, increased enforcement, and rising fear. The trust we have built has given us proximity to hear stories that rarely reach these chambers.

Here on Maui, about 600 members of the Hawaii National Guard were deployed to support our community with recovery after the 2023 wildfires. They provided needed support to Maui at that time and their service here strengthened the bond of respect and appreciation that Maui residents have for the Hawaii National Guard. Unfortunately, that good will is at risk because of what we have witnessed on the mainland. For months we have seen the national guard of other states federalized and deployed in states over the objection of the state's governor. This tactic of deploying a state's national guard over the objection of the state's governor to engage in federalized activity directed at residents of their home state has upended the public perception of the guard as trusted figures engaged in disaster relief and community support in times of need. Policing their friends, family members, and neighbors at the direction of the federal government has reportedly damaged relationships between the guard and the communities they serve, impaired readiness, and lowered morale. **We support SB 2054, SD2, HD2**, because use of the national guard by the federal government over the governor's objection would undermine trust in the Hawaii National Guard, unnecessarily heighten fear in the public, and interfere with readiness of the Guard to serve its intended state and community purposes.

On Maui, we are already witnessing an erosion of trust and an increase in fear as the result of aggressive federal agents and their vastly broadened scope of activity. Community members are afraid to go to work and children are unable to go to school. We have heard stories from healthcare providers of patients forgoing critical care, and from faith leaders that people feel unable to attend religious services due to fear of confrontation by federal agents. Trust in law enforcement of all kinds, even our local police departments, has eroded as a result. **We support SB 2054, SD 2, HD1**, as an appropriate protection of the mission of the Hawaii National Guard by codifying in state law that the Hawaii National Guard not be deployed over the objection of the governor.

Sinceramente,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Veronica', written over a white background.

Veronica Mendoza

Maui Roots Reborn, *Founding Executive Director*

El Pueblo en Accion Maui, *Founding Coalition Member*



www.hicir.org | Instagram @hicir
hicoalitionforimmigrantrights@gmail.com

Testimony of Liza Ryan-Gill
In SUPPORT of SB2054 SD2 HD1

Hearing Date: March 25, 2026

Dear Chair David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair Mahina Poepoe, and members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

My name is **Liza Ryan-Gill**, and I submit this testimony in support of **SB2054 SD2 HD1**, which prohibits the Hawai'i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai'i when the Governor has objected to those deployments, with a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

I am the **Co-Director of the Hawai'i Coalition for Immigrant Rights (HCIR)**, and I am testifying on behalf of HCIR. HCIR is a coalition of more than 30 immigrant-serving and immigrant-led organizations across the pae 'āina working to advance policies that protect immigrant and migrant communities and strengthen Hawai'i as a place where all families can thrive. Our coalition works closely with immigrant and mixed-status families who are deeply affected by aggressive federal enforcement, militarization, and the erosion of trust in public institutions.

SB2054 SD2 HD1 is an important public safety, civil liberties, and state sovereignty measure. The Governor serves as commander-in-chief of the Hawai'i National Guard when it is under state control, and this bill codifies the basic principle that Hawai'i's Guard should not be used to support federal or out-of-state deployments that Hawai'i has formally objected to. That is a matter of clear state authority, democratic accountability, and locally accountable public safety. Hawai'i's military resources should remain aligned with Hawai'i's elected leadership and Hawai'i's community needs.

This bill also matters because deployments of military or quasi-military force into civilian communities can generate fear, confusion, and serious civil rights concerns. For immigrant and mixed-status families, the consequences are especially acute. When communities believe that state Guard forces may be mobilized in support of federal enforcement operations, trust in public institutions erodes. Families become less likely to report crimes, seek help, send children to school, access health care, pursue housing assistance, or seek domestic violence support. Community organizations from Maui to Waipahu have warned that even the perception of escalated federal enforcement presence causes families to withdraw from essential services and undermines safety for everyone. Public safety depends on trust, not fear.



www.hicir.org | Instagram @hicir
hicoalitionforimmigrantrights@gmail.com

For Hawai‘i, this issue must also be understood in historical context. As the Office of Hawaiian Affairs emphasized, for Kānaka Maoli and other communities with a lived history of militarization and over-policing, clarity and restraint in the use of military-style forces in civilian contexts are essential to maintaining trust and preventing unnecessary escalation. Decisions about whether Hawai‘i Guard forces will be used in support of outside deployments should remain transparent, locally accountable, and grounded in the judgment of Hawai‘i’s elected state leadership.

Just as importantly, this bill is narrow and carefully drawn. It does not interfere with deployments or assistance required by federal or state law, and it does not weaken the Hawai‘i National Guard’s core role in disaster response, emergency response, and legitimate public safety missions. Instead, it creates a guardrail against discretionary cooperation over the Governor’s objection and helps prevent mission creep, where limited support roles can quietly expand into deeper operational involvement without clear public accountability. That is a prudent safeguard, not an obstacle to lawful emergency response.

This protection is especially important because the Hawai‘i National Guard has earned deep public trust through service to our communities, including on Maui after the 2023 wildfires. As Maui-based advocates testified, Guard members were rightly seen as trusted figures in disaster relief and community support. Hawai‘i should not jeopardize that goodwill by allowing the Guard to be drawn into contested federal or out-of-state operations over the Governor’s objection. Preserving the integrity of the Guard’s mission is itself a public safety priority.

This bill has already passed House PBS and now comes before JHA as a key state accountability and civil rights measure. The Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs is well-positioned to advance this bill and affirm that Hawai‘i’s military resources must remain accountable to Hawai‘i’s people, Hawai‘i’s laws, and Hawai‘i’s values.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee **PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1**.

Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Sincerely,

Liza Ryan-Gill

Co-Director

Hawai‘i Coalition for Immigrant Rights (HCIR)



Fujiwara & Rosenbaum, LLLC

*Alahea Corporate Tower
1100 Alahea St., Fl. 20, Suite B
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813*

House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs

Wednesday, March 25, 2026, TIME: 2:00 PM, Conference Room 325

Re: Testimony of Fujiwara & Rosenbaum in **Strong Support of S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, Relating to PUBLIC SAFETY**

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Members of the Committee:

As civil rights attorneys we submit this testimony in **strong support** of S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, which would amend Hawai'i Revised Statutes § 121-30 to **prohibit the Hawai'i National Guard** from assisting or cooperating with federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the National Guard of another state operating in Hawai'i when the Governor has objected to those deployments.

S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1 protects the rights of Hawai'i's people. The Hawai'i Constitution supports this bill.

Our **state's armed forces answer to elected civilian leadership** viz a vie **Article V, Section 5 and Article I, Section 16**:

Article V, Section 5 is unambiguous: the **Governor "shall be commander in chief** of the armed forces of the State." The Governor "may call out such forces to execute the laws, suppress or prevent insurrection or lawless violence or repel invasion."

Under **Article I, Section 16**, "[t]he military shall be held in **strict subordination to the civil power.**" These provisions establish that. When the Governor, as the people's elected commander in chief, formally objects to an outside military or law enforcement deployment, the Hawai'i National Guard is not free to assist that deployment on its own initiative. If there was any doubt about this latest Trump scenario, S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1 makes it very clear.

When the Governor determines that an outside deployment threatens our residents' rights and registers a formal objection, state resources should not be used to support operations that may **undermine the constitutional protections Hawai'i affords its people.** For example:

Our Constitution in **Article I, Section 6** recognizes a **right to privacy** that "shall not be infringed without the showing of a compelling state interest" and with **Article I, Section 7** protects against "**unreasonable searches, seizures and invasions of privacy.**" **Article I, Section 5** guarantees **due process, equal protection, and freedom from discrimination based on race, religion, sex, or ancestry.** Native Hawaiian traditional and **cultural rights** are secured by **Article XII, Section 7.**ⁱ

These concerns are not hypothetical. The House Committee on Public Safety found that the current presidential administration has recently federalized and deployed National Guard units in various states despite the objections of those states' Governors, and that these deployments have resulted in serious abuses of civil rights against the residents of those states, including the excessive use of force, racial profiling, and illegal

detention. What happened in those states can happen in Hawai'i. S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1 ensures that if it does, our Guard will not be drawn into operations our elected leadership opposes.

- **It reinforces local accountability and clear lines of authority when outside forces operate in Hawai'i.** Article I, Section 1 of our Constitution vests all political power in the people. The Governor is the people's representative on matters of state military authority. S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1 ensures commanding officers do not unilaterally cooperate with outside forces operating over the Governor's objection.

- **It helps prevent escalation, confusion, and community fear during sensitive operations.** Hawai'i is a small, tightly knit state. When outside military or law enforcement forces operate in our communities over the Governor's objection, and the Hawai'i National Guard is seen assisting them, it sends a contradictory and alarming message. S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1 prevents that confusion.

- **It creates a clear standard for Guard leadership and public transparency.** Today, commanding officers facing the unprecedented experience of a request to assist the Governor's objected-to deployment could now look to unequivocal statutory guidance. S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1 removes ambiguity: if the Governor has objected, do not assist. That clarity protects Guard members and gives the public confidence in their government.

- **It ensures Hawai'i resources are not used to assist deployments Hawai'i's elected leadership has formally objected to.** The bill covers time, money, personnel, data, and all other state resources. If the Governor has determined that a deployment is not in Hawai'i's interest, the state's Guard should not be spending Hawai'i taxpayer resources to support it.

- **The H.D. 1 amendments add important procedural safeguards.** The Governor's objection must be a written determination that specifies the deployment, states the factual basis, identifies the geographic scope and duration, and is provided to the adjutant general, the director of the Hawaii emergency management agency, and the attorney general. The objection must also be maintained as a public record. These requirements ensure transparency and accountability in the exercise of this authority.

The bill is carefully drafted. It does not, e.g., prevent the Guard from responding to genuine emergencies, cooperating with federal agencies on consensual missions, or complying with any binding federal legal obligation. The bill expressly provides that its restrictions apply "[e]xcept as required by federal or state law."

Fujiwara & Rosenbaum respectfully urge the Committee to pass S.B. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1. Thank you for your consideration.

ⁱ Native Hawaiian tenant rights indisputably derive from three distinct sources. Article XII of the Hawaii Constitution protects rights of ahupua'a tenants who are descendants of native Hawaiians who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778, HRS § 7-1 enumerates the certain rights of access to the property of others that are held by native tenants, such as the right to gather fruit, plants, and timber, and the right to obtain drinking water, running water, the right of way and HRS § 1-1 allows the state to establish certain customary Hawaiian rights beyond those found in § 7-1. Pai 'Ohana v. United States, 76 F.3d 280, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 1460 (9th Cir. Haw. 1996).

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 1:52:37 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Victor K. Ramos	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Strongly OPPOSE this bill. Poho!! The State legislature AND the governor has NO control of the military beit National Guard or otherwise. This is purely a political stunt by the demoncrats because of TDS. Focus on real issues affecting real Hawaii residents.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 1:56:05 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
William Caron	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair, Vice Chair, and members of the committee,

I am testifying in **support** of SB2054, which provides a vital and necessary clarification to state law by prohibiting the Hawai‘i National Guard from assisting or cooperating with federal troops, federal law enforcement, or another state's National Guard when the Governor has formally objected to their deployment within our islands.

However, I must express deep concern that the previous committee watered down this bill by removing the words "facilities, property, and equipment" from the types of resources prohibited from being used to assist or cooperate with objectionable federal deployments. I urge this committee to restore the original language so that the bill's intent is fully realized.

Why the Original Language Matters

The original version of SB2054 prohibited the use of Hawai‘i National Guard "facilities, property, equipment, and personnel" to assist or cooperate with federal deployments to which the Governor has objected. This was a comprehensive, commonsense provision. It ensured that if the Governor formally opposes a deployment, none of our state's resources—not our soldiers, not our armories, not our vehicles or equipment—would be used to enable it.

HD1 removed "facilities, property, and equipment" from the prohibition. On its face, this may seem like a technical change. But it is not. It is a significant weakening of the bill.

Under the current draft, the Guard could theoretically continue to provide facilities, property, and equipment to support a federal deployment that the Governor has formally opposed—so long as they do not use "personnel" to do so. This creates a dangerous loophole. Our armories could be used as staging grounds. Our vehicles could be leased or loaned. Our equipment could be deployed. All while the Guard maintains the fiction that they are "only" providing facilities, property, and equipment, not personnel.

This distinction is meaningless to the communities impacted by a deployment—and it undermines the very purpose of the bill.

What the Bill Is Meant to Do

SB2054 is fundamentally about sovereignty, democratic accountability, and the protection of community trust. The Hawai‘i National Guard is a state institution, funded and maintained by the people of Hawai‘i to serve our specific safety and emergency needs. Its mission is to protect our communities, not to be conscripted as a support force for federal or out-of-state operations that our own elected leadership has determined are not in the best interest of our state.

Recent history has shown us the profound dangers of unchecked federal deployments. We have witnessed the weaponization of National Guard units against American citizens in their own communities, an act that erodes public trust and escalates tensions. SB2054 creates a clear, legal firewall to ensure such a scenario cannot unfold here without the state's consent.

But that firewall is only as strong as its components. If the bill prohibits only the use of personnel while leaving facilities, property, and equipment untouched, the firewall has a gaping hole.

Why the Original Language Must Be Restored

The policy rationales for the original, broader language are clear:

- **Governance & Accountability:** The decision to oppose a federal deployment should mean that no state resources—whether human or material—are used to support it. Allowing the Guard to lend its armories, trucks, or helicopters while claiming they are "only" providing facilities, property, and equipment evades democratic oversight.
- **Operational Clarity:** The original language provides unambiguous guidance to Guard leadership: when the Governor objects, the rule is "no assistance" across the board. The narrowed language invites creative interpretation and potential conflicts.
- **Protection of Community Trust:** When communities see state facilities being used to stage federal operations they oppose, the perception is one of complicity, regardless of whether Guard personnel are directly involved. Restoring the original language protects the Guard's reputation as a protector of the people, not an enabler of unwelcome federal actions.
- **Prevention of Mission Creep:** Without a clear prohibition on facilities, property, and equipment, "limited support" can quickly blur into deeper entanglement. Once our armories are open, our trucks are rolling, and our equipment is in use, the distinction between supporting a deployment and participating in it becomes meaningless.

SB2054 is a prudent and necessary measure to affirm state sovereignty, uphold democratic principles, and safeguard the bond between the Hawai‘i National Guard and the people it is sworn to protect. But the bill as currently drafted has been unnecessarily narrowed. I urge this committee to **restore the original language prohibiting the use of Hawai‘i National Guard facilities, property, equipment, and personnel** to assist or cooperate with federal deployments to which the Governor has formally objected.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 3:06:50 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

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

Comments:

I am opposed to this bill with reservations as I do not feel that this bill is being written, supported or intends to prevent any government overreach. I actually feel this is an example of government overreach and is intended to prevent the federal government from actually protecting the citizens of this nation. I also don't support the national guard or any troops from being used to harm Americans but thankfully I do not think that is happening in our nation.

The federal government has used national guard and ICE to protect our citizens from criminals that this law seeks to ironically protect. Ironically illegal immigrants and those terrorizing cities in the mainland regarding the use of these law enforcement bodies through violence and is often far beyond the definition of protesting. I support protesting, anyone is allowed to make themselves look like an imbecile if they want to as long as they aren't harming others. For far too long though we have witnessed cities being burned, riots taking place, doxxing through coordinated terrorist like actions of federal agents personal info and many other absurd things due to opposing political beliefs.

I do not trust that Josh Green has the best interest of myself, my family or this state, let alone the United States of America in mind with the bills he supports and actions he takes as a "leader" in Hawaii. I do think giving him the authority to go against our federal government is inappropriate and I hope this bill is denied. Even if the political landscape were to be changed I think this bill would be used abusively for political reasons and not to actually promote lawfulness or safety of citizens. Protecting and harboring illegal immigrants who take jobs away and use tax resources while American citizens aren't getting the help they need is absolutely wrong to do and Hawaii political rivals should be using resources like these bills and laws to impinge or prevent the federal government from doing its duty to protect.

In the end I wish the bill to state that if needed for the protection of our country that the federal government could in fact call them into use. I do think this is necessary due the actions of leftist mercenaries, also known as democrat politicians, who leave our cities and people at risk with the promise they are here to keep us safe. All I see daily from the left is more political violence, willingness to destroy my ability to protect my family or myself and now this, something to even further hinder our federal government from stopping what the left has literally caused by design. This is shameful and this absurdly politically motivated bill should not be allowed to be passed.

Please vote no on SB2054 and remember we are all Americans, even the ones you try to harm through your coordinated political attacks. I don't wish harm on any Americans, but I do wish to see laws abided by and people given all the tools needed to help our nation prosper, starting with the individual and our constitutionally protected rights.

SB2054 SD2 LIMITS NATIONAL GUARD DEPLOYMENT

I am writing in **strong support of SB2054 SD2 both personally and as a member of the Indivisible Hawaii Statewide Network (IHSN)**. This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law. As amended this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

As we have seen in Los Angeles, Portland OR, Minneapolis, and now Maine, among other cities, the federal deployment of ICE, CBP and other agencies is a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members. The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and according to court decisions in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawaii must act now, before the crisis comes to our shores with massive force, to protect our Guard and the people of the state from the rampant unlawful, unconstitutional, overreach of the Trump administration and federal agencies.

SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal power being used to abuse our people. I strongly urge its passage.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important issue.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 6:41:00 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mona Eisa	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing in strong support of SB2054 SD2 both personally and as a member of the Indivisible Hawaii Statewide Network (IHSN). This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law.

As amended this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

As we have seen in Los Angeles, Portland OR, Minneapolis, and now Maine, among other cities, the federal deployment of ICE, CBP and other agencies is a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members.

The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and according to court decisions in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawaii must act now, before the crisis comes to our shores with massive force, to protect our Guard and the people of the state from the rampant unlawful, unconstitutional, overreach of the Trump administration and federal agencies.

SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal power being used to abuse our people.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify,

Mona Eisa, Honolulu, HI

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 6:48:45 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marguerite Koster	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing in strong support of SB2054 SD2 both personally and as a member of the Indivisible Hawaii Statewide Network (IHSN). This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law. As amended this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

As we have seen in Los Angeles, Portland OR, Minneapolis, and now Maine, among other cities, the federal deployment of ICE, CBP and other agencies is a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members. The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and according to court decisions in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawaii must act now, before the crisis comes to our shores with massive force, to protect our Guard and the people of the state from the rampant unlawful, unconstitutional, overreach of the Trump administration and federal agencies.

SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal power being used to abuse our people. I strongly urge its passage.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important issue.

Marguerite Koster

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 6:49:53 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Younghee Overly	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Thank you for this opportunity to support SB2054 which would increase penalties for firearm violations.

Younghee Overly, a member of Indivisible Hawaii

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 7:21:04 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Cory Harden	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha legislators,

I strongly support this bill to prohibit Hawai'i National Guard from assisting or cooperating with the National Guard of another state, or with federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawai'i, if the Governor objects in writing to such assistance or cooperation, with few exceptions.

Federal deployments in Los Angeles, Oregon, and Maine have brought disruption and even deaths. We must stand against these dangerous and unconstitutional actions.

mahalo,
Cory Harden, Hilo
member, Indivisible

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 7:48:13 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lois Langham	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

SB2054 SD2 LIMITS NATIONAL GUARD DEPLOYMENT

I am writing in strong support of SB2054 SD2 both personally and as a member of the Indivisible Hawaii Statewide Network (IHSN). This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law. As amended this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

As we have seen in Los Angeles, Portland OR, Minneapolis, and now Maine, among other cities, the federal deployment of ICE, CBP and other agencies is a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members. The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and according to court decisions in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawaii must act now, before the crisis comes to our shores with massive force, to protect our Guard and the people of the state from the rampant unlawful, unconstitutional, overreach of the Trump administration and federal agencies.

SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal power being used to abuse our people. I strongly urge its passage.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important issue.

Eileen Cain
720 Mahi'ai St., Apt. E
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96826-5635
eileencaïn808@gmail.com
March 23, 2026

Aloha, Representative David Tarnas, Chair, House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs
Vice-Chair Representative Mahina Poepoe,
Members of the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs

Aloha, Representatives,

**I am writing this testimony in support of SB2054 SD2 HD1, "Relating to Public Safety"
(Limiting Hawai'i National Guard Deployment).**

Only **the Governor of Hawai'i, or his or her designated representative**, can be empowered to decide if and when the **Hawai'i National Guard** should be deployed. The Guard must not be deployed for any reason other than one specified by the Governor, and the Governor should **specify what the reason is and indicate, when possible, how long the Guard will be used for this purpose. There must be no deployment of the Hawai'i National Guard against the Governor's wishes or without his express permission or over his objections.**

We citizens need you, our legislators, to act on this now, before any crisis comes to our island home, to protect the Guard and the people of Hawai'i from any unlawful, unconstitutional, or other sort of overreach of the federal government or any other government.

We citizens need the assurance that any decision to deploy the **Hawai'i National Guard comes from someone here in the islands who has the authority to do so.**

Please vote in favor of **SB2054 SD2 HD1**.

Mahalo,

Eileen Cain,
Mō'ili'ili, Honolulu, Hawai'i

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 9:30:55 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jesse Hutchison	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Thank you!

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 10:00:29 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Aimee E McCullough	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing in strong support of SB2054 SD2 both personally and as a member of the Indivisible Hawaii Statewide Network (IHSN). This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law. As amended this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify,

Aimee McCullough

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 10:33:24 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Tim Huycke	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I very strongly support SB2054.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/23/2026 11:11:13 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Gaye Chan	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

People join the National Guard to help others in times of need such as aftermath of floods, hurricanes, and fires. Since Trump became President again, they have been deployed instead to protect Federal forces who are terrorizing cities like Los Angeles, Portland OR, Minneapolis, and now Maine under the pretext of deporting criminals. Trump said, "The worst of the worst!" DHS' deployment of ICE, CBP, and other agencies is nothing of the kind. They are a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members.

The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and affirmed by court decisions, in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawai'i must act now. SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal overreach.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 5:10:27 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jeannine Johnson	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I support SB2054 SD2 HD1.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 6:35:11 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kehaulani Coleman	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Thank you

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 7:08:02 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jane Aquino	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing in strong support of SB2054 SD2 both personally and as a member of the Indivisible Hawaii Statewide Network (IHSN). This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law. As amended this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

As we have seen in Los Angeles, Portland OR, Minneapolis, and now Maine, among other cities, the federal deployment of ICE, CBP and other agencies is a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members. The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and according to court decisions in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawaii must act now, before the crisis comes to our shores with massive force, to protect our Guard and the people of the state from the rampant unlawful, unconstitutional, overreach of the Trump administration and federal agencies.

SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal power being used to abuse our people. I strongly urge its passage.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important issue. Jane Aquino, Indivisible

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 8:12:56 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kathleen Dickson	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing in strong support of SB2054 SD2. This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law. As amended, this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

As we have seen in Los Angeles, CA, Portland OR, Minneapolis, MN, and now Maine, as well as other cities, the federal deployment of ICE, CBP and other agencies is a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members. The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and according to court decisions in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawaii must act now, before the crisis comes to our shores with massive force, to protect our Guard and the people of the state from the rampant unlawful, unconstitutional, overreach of the Trump administration and federal agencies.

SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal power being used to abuse our people. I strongly urge its passage.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important issue.

Kate Dickson, Waikiki

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 8:41:00 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Thaddeus Pham	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and JHA Committee Members,

As a local resident concerned with public safety, I write in strong **support of SB2054 SD2 HD1**, which prohibits the Hawai‘i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai‘i when the Governor has objected to those deployments, with a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

The Governor serves as commander-in-chief of the Hawai‘i National Guard under state control. SB2054 SD2 HD1 codifies that authority by ensuring state military resources cannot be used to support federal deployments that Hawai‘i has not consented to. As federal military and law enforcement deployments to states have increased — many challenged in courts as illegal, and several found to violate the law — it is essential that Hawai‘i have clear statutory guardrails that protect our state’s sovereignty and its ability to define its own public safety priorities.

This bill also matters for community trust and safety. Immigrant and mixed-status families should not fear that state Guard forces will be mobilized against them in civil immigration operations. The bill is narrowly tailored — it includes a carve-out for legally required assistance — and it has already passed House PBS. The Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs, which has been the leading force for civil rights and constitutional protections this session, is well-positioned to advance this state sovereignty protection toward Finance and final passage.

Please **PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1**.

Mahalo,

Thaddeus Pham

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 9:18:42 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Nathan Leo Braulick	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Mahalo,

Nathan Leo Braulick

96826

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 9:32:02 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Judith Mura	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

STRONGLY SUPPORT SB2054 SD2 HD1

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 9:47:11 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Brodie Lockard	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I support this bill.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 9:54:15 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
James E Raymond	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Thank you. I am a member of Indivisible Windward.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 9:54:39 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marcela Montalto	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Limiting National Guard deployment helps protect civil liberties while ensuring military resources are used appropriately and only when truly necessary. Clear guidelines and oversight can prevent overreach, reduce the risk of escalation in civilian situations, and reinforce the principle that public safety should be led by community-based, accountable institutions. This bill promotes a balanced approach that respects both security needs and democratic values.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 10:08:13 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Larry Smith	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

Please support this Bill.

Larry Smith

Indivisible

HD27

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 11:16:05 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Robert Justice, M.D.	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Rep. David A. Tarnas, Chair; Rep. Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair; and Members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

RE: SB2054 SD2 HD1

I am a resident of Kapolei and a member of Indivisible Hawai'i Statewide Network. I am writing today to provide testimony in strong support of SB2054 SD2 HD1. The Bill prohibits the Hawai'i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai'i when the Governor has objected to those deployments. It amends HRS §121-30 and includes a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

The Governor is the commander-in-chief of the Hawai'i National Guard under state control. This bill codifies that authority in statute, ensuring that state military resources cannot be used to support federal deployments that Hawai'i has not consented to, including deployments for immigration enforcement or civil unrest operations that contradict state policy.

As federal military and law enforcement deployments to states have increased nationally, many challenged in courts as illegal, it is critical that Hawai'i has clear statutory guardrails. Without them, state Guard resources could be pulled into federal operations that harm community trust, implicate immigrant and mixed-status families, or contradict the Governor's stated policy positions. This Bill is also consistent with the national trend. Multiple states are pursuing similar national guard sovereignty protections in response to federal deployment overreach. Courts have repeatedly found some of these federal deployments illegal.

Because this bill addresses important civil rights, constitutional, and community safety issues, I strongly support its passage.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

Respectfully,

Robert L. Justice, M.D.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 11:22:57 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Dianne Deauna	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Testimony of Dianne Deauna

In SUPPORT of SB2054 SD2 HD1

Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Representative David A. Tarnas, Chair

Representative Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Hearing Date: March 25, 2026

Dear Chair David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair Mahina Poepoe, and members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

My name is Dianne Deauna, and I submit this testimony in **support of SB2054 SD2 HD1**, which prohibits the Hawai‘i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai‘i when the Governor has objected to those deployments, with a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

I am testifying as an individual, in my capacity as an international student, and as someone who has done organizing work with the Filipino community.

The Governor serves as commander-in-chief of the Hawai‘i National Guard under state control. SB2054 SD2 HD1 codifies that authority by ensuring state military resources cannot be used to support federal deployments that Hawai‘i has not consented to. As federal military and law enforcement deployments to states have increased — many challenged in courts as illegal, and several found to violate the law — it is essential that Hawai‘i have clear statutory guardrails that protect our state’s sovereignty and its ability to define its own public safety priorities.

This bill also matters for community trust and safety. Immigrant and mixed-status families should not fear that state Guard forces will be mobilized against them in civil immigration

operations. The bill is narrowly tailored — it includes a carve-out for legally required assistance — and it has already passed House PBS. The Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs, which has been the leading force for civil rights and constitutional protections this session, is well-positioned to advance this state sovereignty protection toward Finance and final passage.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee **PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1**. Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Sincerely,

Dianne Deauna
Hawai'i Filipinos for Truth, Justice and Democracy

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY & HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

Rep. David A. Tarnas, Chair

Rep. Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

HEARING:

Wednesday, March 25, 2026 at 2:00 pm

Via Videoconference and Conference Room 325

TESTIMONY IN **SUPPORT** OF SB 2054, SD2, HD1 - RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY.

Aloha Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Members of the Committee,

My name is Christine Andrews and I am a long-term resident of Wailuku, Maui. I am also an attorney licensed in the state of Hawaii for over 25 years and a founding coalition member of El Pueblo en Acción (EPA) Maui – The People in Action Maui. I am writing today in **strong support of SB 2054, SD2, HD1**, which prohibits the Hawaii National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawaii when the governor has objected to the deployments.

I currently volunteer as a Know Your Rights and constitutional protector trainer and educator statewide. I have helped train teachers and students, business owners and union members, faith leaders and health care providers, parents and senior citizens on what their constitutional rights are, that these rights apply to all within the United States, regardless of citizenship status, and how to ensure these rights are not violated. I have also trained them how to prepare themselves, their staff, and their places of work and community service for interactions with federal agents.

As an attorney, it has been hard to witness what is happening on the mainland. It was especially chilling to see state national guard being deployed over the objection of the governors of the state whose guard was deployed and over the objection of the governors of the state they were deployed to. It is beyond the scope of the intended purpose of the national guard for them to engage in law enforcement matters in the manner that they were. I was living in St Paul, Minnesota at the time that the state national guard was deployed there, at the request of the governor, and in response to civil unrest. I remember walking with my daughter down the street in my neighborhood, and having the guard there, with their military vehicles and weapons. It was unnerving then. More recently, I visited my daughter at graduate school in Baltimore while the national guard was deployed in Washington, DC. I traveled to DC and the presence of the national guard there made it feel like I was not in the United States anymore. DC always has a ton of law enforcement presence, but I have never seen anything like the national guard in their military garb, carrying weapons like that. It felt dystopian.

I live on Maui, and I remember when the Hawaii National Guard was deployed here to assist after the 2023 wildfires. The image in my mind, like the popular imagination, is that our national guard is here to help us in the event of a disaster. I want to keep it that way. I do not want our Guard deployed over the objection of the governor, simply as a matter of public safety and state's rights, and there is also the broader issue of costs and care. It seemed that there was uncertainty about who was paying for the forced deployments on the mainland, and that the Guard were not properly provided for or housed. Hawaii cannot and should not bear the financial cost, the reputational cost, or the readiness cost of deploying our Guard over the objection of the governor. That is why I respectfully request your **vote in support** of SB 2054, SD2, HD1.

Mahalo,

Christine Andrews, JD

Wailuku, Maui

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 12:05:26 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jessica Kuzmier	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha, I am writing in support of SB2054. I believe codifying into state law a statute which helps guard against federal overreach and allows the governor to have agency in this matter. Mahalo for your consideration.

Testimony of In SUPPORT of SB2054 SD2 HD1

Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Representative David A. Tarnas, Chair
Representative Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Hearing Date: March 25, 2026

Dear Chair David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair Mahina Poepoe, and members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

My name is Jeremiah Brown, and I submit this testimony in **support of SB2054 SD2 HD1**, which prohibits the Hawai‘i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai‘i when the Governor has objected to those deployments, with a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

The Governor serves as commander-in-chief of the Hawai‘i National Guard under state control. SB2054 SD2 HD1 codifies that authority by ensuring state military resources cannot be used to support federal deployments that Hawai‘i has not consented to. As federal military and law enforcement deployments to states have increased — many challenged in courts as illegal, and several found to violate the law — it is essential that Hawai‘i have clear statutory guardrails that protect our state’s sovereignty and its ability to define its own public safety priorities.

This bill also matters for community trust and safety. Immigrant and mixed-status families should not fear that state Guard forces will be mobilized against them in civil immigration operations. The bill is narrowly tailored — it includes a carve-out for legally required assistance — and it has already passed House PBS. The Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs, which has been the leading force for civil rights and constitutional protections this session, is well-positioned to advance this state sovereignty protection toward Finance and final passage.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee **PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1**. Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Sincerely,
Jeremiah Brown
Waialua, Oahu

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 12:38:06 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Peter Matlock	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Testimony of Peter Matlock

In SUPPORT of SB2054 SD2 HD1

Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Representative David A. Tarnas, Chair

Representative Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Hearing Date: March 25, 2026

Dear Chair David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair Mahina Poepoe, and members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

My name is Peter Matlock, I am a resident of Hawai'i Island, and I am submitting this testimony as an individual.

I support SB2054 SD2 HD1

This bill prohibits the Hawai'i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai'i when the Governor has objected to those deployments. There is a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

Federal agents have engaged in overreach in deployments to cities across the country, and their actions have frequently been found to be unlawful in addition to violating good policing practices.

We cannot have our Hawai'i National Guard being complicit when our Governor objects. It is essential that Hawai'i have clear statutory guardrails that protect our state's sovereignty and its ability to define our own public safety priorities.

I respectfully request that the Committee **PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1**. Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Sincerely,

Peter Matlock

Kailua Kona, HI

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 12:56:51 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Nancy Convard	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Testimony of Nancy Convard

In SUPPORT of SB2054 SD2 HD1

Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Representative David A. Tarnas, Chair

Representative Mahina Poepoe, Vice Chair

Hearing Date: March 25, 2026

Dear Chair David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair Mahina Poepoe, and members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

My name is Nancy Convard, and I submit this testimony in support of SB2054 SD2 HD1, which prohibits the Hawai'i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai'i when the Governor has objected to those deployments, with a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

I am a community member committed to advocating for democracy and civil rights. I am testifying as an individual in connection with Indivisible Hawaii and Campaign for Immigrant Rights

The Governor serves as commander-in-chief of the Hawai'i National Guard under state control. SB2054 SD2 HD1 codifies that authority by ensuring state military resources cannot be used to support federal deployments that Hawai'i has not consented to. As federal military and law enforcement deployments to states have increased — many challenged in courts as illegal, and several found to violate the law — it is essential that Hawai'i have clear statutory guardrails that protect our state's sovereignty and its ability to define its own public safety priorities.

This bill also matters for community trust and safety. Immigrant and mixed-status families should not fear that state Guard forces will be mobilized against them in civil immigration operations. The bill is narrowly tailored — it includes a carve-out for legally required assistance — and it has already passed House PBS. The Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs, which has been the leading force for civil rights and constitutional protections this session, is well-positioned to advance this state sovereignty protection toward Finance and final passage.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee PASS SB2054 SD2 HD1. Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Sincerely,

Nancy Convard

Community Member and Indivisible Member and CIR supporter

Nconvard@gmail.com; 202-288-8822

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 1:46:00 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lily Troy MD	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I SUPPORT SB2054

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 2:19:36 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Donna Grabow	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

Bill SB2054 is essential for ensuring the National Guard in Hawaii remains focused on serving the people of Hawai‘i—not being pulled into federal operations that may conflict with state priorities.

It provides support for a Hawaii Governor to issue a written objection to **Federal law agencies** or to **out-of-state National Guard** forces from operating in Hawai‘i.

The bill ensures the Governor's right to formally object to such Federal deployments.

Sincerely,

Donna Grabow, Hilo

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 2:29:54 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kristy Gund	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing in strong support of SB2054 SD2 both personally and as a member of the Indivisible Hawaii Statewide Network (IHSN). This Bill would amend §121-30 HRS to prohibit Hawaii National Guard from assisting or cooperating with either the National Guard of another state or federal troops or law enforcement deployed to Hawaii if the Governor has objected to the deployment, except as required by law. As amended this bill requires specific written direction from the Governor to minimize confusion and risk for members of the Guard.

As we have seen in Los Angeles, Portland OR, Minneapolis, and now Maine, among other cities, the federal deployment of ICE, CBP and other agencies is a threat to civil society, the rule of law, and the very lives of our neighbors and family members. The President called out the California National Guard over the objection of the state Governor, and according to court decisions in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Hawaii must act now, before the crisis comes to our shores with massive force, to protect our Guard and the people of the state from the rampant unlawful, unconstitutional, overreach of the Trump administration and federal agencies.

SB2054 SD2 will provide one piece of a defense against federal power being used to abuse our people. I strongly urge its passage.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important issue.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 7:12:52 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Nicholas Zehr	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Dear Chair, Vice Chair, and members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of SB2054. This measure strengthens clarity in Hawai‘i law by reaffirming the role of the State’s elected leadership in determining when state military resources may assist federal forces or other states’ National Guard units operating within Hawai‘i. Importantly, SB2054 preserves the Governor’s full authority to activate the Hawai‘i National Guard for disasters, emergencies, civil defense, and mutual aid under existing compacts.

The primary value of SB2054 is that it provides clear statutory guidance regarding when state-controlled military resources may be used in operations within Hawai‘i that do not have the consent of the Governor. Clear lines of authority strengthen accountability, reduce operational ambiguity, and reinforce public trust when military personnel operate in civilian environments.

Concerns have been raised that the bill could expose Guardsmen to legal risk if conflicting state and federal authorities arise. However, SB2054 does not alter the federal government’s authority to activate National Guard members under Title 10 or the President’s authority under the Insurrection Act. In those circumstances, Guardsmen are federalized and operate under federal command. SB2054 addresses only the use of state-controlled resources operating under state authority. Clarifying that distinction actually helps reduce uncertainty by delineating when personnel are operating under state versus federal command structures.

The bill also does not prevent lawful federal operations from occurring within Hawai‘i. Federal forces retain the authority granted to them under federal law. SB2054 simply ensures that Hawai‘i’s state military assets are not required to assist such operations absent the consent of Hawai‘i’s elected leadership, unless required by law. This approach respects the constitutional framework in which both state and federal governments possess defined authorities.

The United States Constitution contemplates a balance between federal authority and state authority over the militia. Article I, Section 8 provides Congress the power to call forth the militia for specific purposes, while reserving to the states the authority over training and appointment of officers. The Tenth Amendment further affirms that powers not delegated to the federal government remain with the states and the people. SB2054 reflects this long-standing federalist structure by reaffirming the state's role in determining how its own resources are used within its jurisdiction.

From a governance standpoint, the measure promotes transparency and accountability in situations involving the presence of armed forces in civilian communities. Clear statutory guidance ensures that service members, commanders, and civilian authorities operate with well-defined legal parameters. This clarity benefits both the public and the men and women of the Hawai'i National Guard who serve honorably under difficult and complex circumstances.

SB2054 therefore represents a prudent reaffirmation of constitutional structure, civilian control, and clear operational authority. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to support this measure.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 9:23:03 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Keri Monteith	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Please support this bill preventing the Hawaii National Guard from being used in federal operations deemed unlawful or against the interests of Hawaii residents, such as federal immigration raids.

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/24/2026 10:00:11 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
John Terry	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on SB 2054.

I understand the intent behind this bill. It is important to protect state authority and ensure that Hawai'i maintains control over its National Guard when operating within the state. That is a reasonable concern, and I respect the desire to protect local decision-making.

However, I oppose SB 2054 and have concerns that it may create unintended consequences that could affect public safety, emergency response, and agency coordination during times of crisis.

The Hawai'i National Guard plays a critical role not only in state emergencies such as hurricanes, floods, wildfires, and volcanic activity, but also in joint operations with federal partners. In real-world emergencies, coordination between state and federal agencies is not optional — it is necessary. Disasters and large-scale emergencies do not operate within neat jurisdictional boundaries, and our response systems are built on cooperation and unified command.

If this bill restricts the Hawai'i National Guard from working with federal military units, federal law enforcement, or other states' National Guard units when there is disagreement at the leadership level, it could slow response times, create confusion in command structure, and reduce the overall effectiveness of emergency response operations.

In a major disaster, Hawai'i is geographically isolated. We rely heavily on federal assistance and support from other states through mutual aid agreements. Any policy that could limit or complicate that cooperation should be considered very carefully, because during a large-scale emergency, time matters, coordination matters, and clear authority matters.

There is also a concern about operational uncertainty. If Guard members are placed in a position where there is a conflict between state and federal direction, it could create hesitation at the exact moment when decisive action is needed. Emergency response works best when roles, authority, and coordination are clearly defined ahead of time, not during a crisis.

I believe there is a way to address the concerns this bill seeks to address without potentially limiting cooperation during emergencies. Rather than prohibiting deployment, it may be more effective to establish clearer guidelines, communication requirements, and formal coordination

procedures between the State and federal authorities so that disagreements can be resolved without restricting operational support.

This is not just a legal or political issue — it is a public safety issue. The primary question should be: will this make Hawai‘i safer and improve our ability to respond to emergencies? If there is any chance that it could slow response, limit coordination, or create confusion during a crisis, then it deserves very careful reconsideration. For these reasons, I oppose SB2054

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

Respectfully submitted,
John Terry

SB-2054-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/25/2026 2:33:37 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/25/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Carrie Ann Shirota	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Poepoe, and Committee Members,

I write in strong support of **SB2054 SD2 HD1**, which prohibits the Hawai‘i National Guard from deploying to assist federal troops, federal law enforcement, or the national guard of any other state operating in Hawai‘i when the Governor has objected to those deployments, with a carve-out where assistance is required by federal or state law.

The Committee Report for HD1 cited contemporary circumstances as justification for passage of this measure:

"Your Committee finds that the current presidential administration has recently federalized and deployed National Guard units in various states, despite the objections of those states' Governors. These deployments have resulted in serious abuses of civil rights against the residents of those states, including the excessive use of force, racial profiling, and illegal detention. Your Committee believes that this measure is necessary to protect the State's sovereignty and to prevent state resources, including the Hawaii National Guard, from being co-opted into federal operations that lack the consent of the State's government."

Additionally, we should look to the past to understand the ways in which the National Guard has been unjustly deployed against the Kingdom of Hawai'i, Queen Lili'uokalani and its citizens.

The overthrow occurred on January 17, 1893.

On January 27, 1893, the Provisional Government created the National Guard of Hawaii - designed to replace the dissolved Royal Guard and to provide a military force loyal to the new government.

The National Guard of Hawai'i was also deployed to subjugate loyalists to the Queen and Kingdom, and to apprehend people with Hansen's disease at Kalaulau Valley on Kaua'i.

To learn more about the National Guard's role of oppression in Hawai'i, read https://ags.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/hsa_NGH1893-1900_fa.pdf.

In closing, while I support this measure, it does not include safeguards to prevent any future Governor or the Governor's designee from deploying the National Guard against the people of Hawai'i.

I urge you to pass SB2054 SD2 HD1.

Sincerely,

Carrie Ann Shirota, Esq.

Honolulu, Hawai'i