



**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS,
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & TOURISM**
KA 'OIHANA HO'OMOHALA PĀ'OIHANA, 'IMI WAIWAI
A HO'OMĀKA'IKA'I

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR

SYLVIA LUKE
LT. GOVERNOR

JAMES KUNANE TOKIOKA
DIRECTOR

DANE K. WICKER
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

No. 1 Capitol District Building, 250 South Hotel Street, 5th Floor, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2359, Honolulu, Hawaii 96804
Web site: dbedt.hawaii.gov

Telephone: (808) 586-2355
Fax: (808) 586-2377

Statement of
JAMES KUNANE TOKIOKA
Director

Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism
before the
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Tuesday, April 7, 2026
2:00 PM
State Capitol, Conference Room 308

In consideration of
SB2074, SD1, HD2
RELATING TO STATE FACILITIES

Chair Todd, Vice Chair Takenouchi, and Members of the Committee:

The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) **supports** SB2074, SD1, HD2, which allows the naming rights of the Stadium Facility to be leased to any public or private entity, requires any revenues derived from advertising or marketing in/on the Stadium Facility to be deposited into the Stadium Development Special Fund, authorizes the display of the name of any entity that leased the naming rights to a stadium operated by the Stadium Authority on the exterior of the stadium, and exempts concessions within the Stadium Facility from Chapter 102, HRS.

DBEDT is supportive of creating additional revenue opportunities for the stadium, so long as it is with authorization of the Stadium Authority and is within the guardrails outlined in the measure. In addition to providing revenue that could contribute to a higher-quality facility, thoughtfully designed marketing can also positively contribute to the branding of the events and the overall entertainment experience for attendees. The increased flexibility could also provide opportunities for public service announcements, community messaging and promotion of upcoming events.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this measure.

Josh Green, M.D.
Governor

Sylvia Luke
Lt. Governor

James Kunane Tokioka
DBEDT Director

Dane K. Wicker
DBEDT Deputy Director

Walter Thoemmes
Stadium Authority Chair

Michael R. Yadao
Stadium Authority Executive Director



Statement of
MICHAEL R. YADAO
Stadium Authority
Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism
before the

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Tuesday, April 7, 2026
02:00 PM
State Capitol, Conference Room 308

In consideration of
S.B. 2074, SD1, HD2
RELATING TO STATE FACILITIES.

Chair Todd, Vice Chair Takenouchi and members of the Committee.

The Stadium Authority supports Senate Bill 2074, SD1, HD2 which allows the naming rights of any state-owned facility to be leased to any public or private entity. The ability to lease naming rights to the new Aloha Stadium will provide the Stadium Authority and/or Aloha Halawa District Partners, the entity the Stadium Authority intends to contract to operate and maintain the new Aloha Stadium, another revenue source to manage and operate the stadium. The Stadium Authority also recognizes that the Legislature has already provided a portion of the funding necessary to develop a globally competitive sports and entertainment facility and has consistently emphasized that the broader Stadium District should be realized through parallel residential and commercial development that strengthens long-term economic activity and supports the stadium's sustainability. Naming rights are a standard revenue tool that can help reduce ongoing reliance on public support while the Stadium District is built out. While it is my understanding the Stadium Authority currently has the authority to lease the naming rights to its stadium pursuant to HRS Section 109-2 Subsection (4), this bill specifically states such ability for state-owned facilities.

In addition, the Legislature has asked the Stadium Authority to explore other funding options and revenue strategies to finance the project and sustain long-term operations and maintenance of the Stadium District. Allowing naming rights is a widely used approach across major venues nationwide and is one practical option to help generate predictable, contract-based revenue.

By way of market context, venue naming-rights agreements commonly generate multi-million dollars annually, with value driven by venue profile, event volume, media exposure, and surrounding district activity. For example, SoFi Stadium has been reported at more than \$30 million per year over a long-term term, and the former Staples Center naming rights agreement rebranded as Crypto.com Arena has been reported at \$700 million over 20 years (about \$35 million per year). More typical NFL venue naming-rights agreements can fall in the single-digit millions per year. For example, Reuters reported a recent NFL stadium naming-rights agreement at over \$8 million annually. Across U.S. sports more broadly, one recent compilation reported an average naming-rights value of about \$7.4 million per year, while noting that a relatively small number of very large agreements account for a significant share of total value.

Furthermore, this bill requires any revenues derived from advertising or marketing in or on any state-owned facility to be deposited into the appropriate special fund of the state agency that owns the facility. HRS Section 109 3.5 established the stadium development special fund in which such revenues will be deposited. Any naming-rights revenue would ultimately support stadium operations and maintenance, either through deposit to the Stadium Development Special Fund as contemplated by statute, and/or through the stadium development and operations agreement structure under which the operator applies those receipts to O&M responsibilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Testimony to the House Committee on Finance
Representative Chris Todd, Chair
Representative Jenna Takenouchi, Vice Chair**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026, at 2:00PM
Conference Room 308 & Videoconference**

RE: SB2074 SD1 HD2 Relating to State Facilities

Aloha e Chair Todd, Vice Chair Takenouchi, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Sherry Menor, President and CEO of the Chamber of Commerce Hawaii ("The Chamber"). The Chamber supports House Bill 2074 Senate Draft 1 House Draft 2 (SB2074 SD1 HD2), allows the naming rights of the Stadium Facility to be leased to any public or private entity. Requires any revenues derived from advertising or marketing in or on the Stadium Facility to be deposited into the Stadium Development Special Fund. Authorizes the display of the name of any entity that leased the naming rights to a stadium operated by the Stadium Authority on the exterior of the stadium. Exempts concessions within the Stadium Facility from chapter 102, HRS.

SB2074 SD1 HD2 aligns with our 2030 Blueprint for Hawaii: An Economic Action Plan, specifically under the policy pillar for Economic Action. The Chamber stands in strong support of economic opportunity that elevates Hawaii's capacity as a host for major sporting, music, and other entertainment events. The new Stadium offers this opportunity, along with opportunity for increased housing supply, public recreational space, and commercial space. This bill offers a sizeable revenue generation opportunity for the Stadium Authority. Generating this revenue for the Authority helps to close the funding gap the project is experiencing in its early stage of development. Increasing financing security for a project of this scale is crucial for optimizing the guest experience and actualizing the stadium infrastructure the state deserves. With so much taxpayer money being used to support the construction of this project, the Stadium Authority should be encouraged to pursue every sensible means of revenue generation to fill the rest of their funding needs. Leasing these naming rights for this Stadium is an industry-standard practice that deserves exploration and support. The economic opportunity the new Stadium can deliver to the state and the economy cannot be understated.

The Chamber of Commerce Hawaii is the state's leading business advocacy organization, dedicated to improving Hawaii's economy and securing Hawaii's future for growth and opportunity. Our mission is to foster a vibrant economic climate. As such, we support initiatives and policies that align with the 2030 Blueprint for Hawaii that create opportunities to strengthen overall competitiveness, improve the quantity and skills of available workforce, diversify the economy, and build greater local wealth.

We respectfully ask to pass Senate Bill 2074 Senate Draft 1 House Draft 2. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.



HAWAII REGIONAL COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS

April 07, 2026

TO: The Honorable Chris Todd, Chair
The Honorable Jenna Takenouchi, Vice Chair
Members of the House Committee on Finance

RE: **TESTIMONY IN STRONG SUPPORT OF SB2074 HD2**

Aloha Chair Todd, Vice Chair Takenouchi, and Members of the Committee:

The Hawai'i Regional Council of Carpenters (HRCC), representing over 6,000 skilled union carpenters and tradespeople across the islands, thanks you for the opportunity to submit testimony in **strong support** of SB2074 HD2.

This measure strengthens the financial sustainability of Hawai'i's stadium facilities by allowing naming rights agreements and expanding revenue opportunities through advertising and marketing, with revenues deposited into the Stadium Development Special Fund for reinvestment into stadium operations and infrastructure.

Providing stable revenue sources helps reduce long-term taxpayer burden while supporting continued investment in public facilities that generate economic activity and local jobs. Modern stadiums depend on diversified funding mechanisms, and this bill brings Hawai'i in line with standard industry practice.

Other states have successfully used stadium naming rights as a proven revenue tool to support public facilities and reduce reliance on taxpayer funding. Across the United States, naming rights agreements generate millions of dollars annually that help finance stadium operations, upgrades, and long-term maintenance without increasing public costs. For example, major venues such as SoFi Stadium and Mercedes-Benz Stadium secured naming rights agreements worth hundreds of millions of dollars over multi-year terms, providing predictable revenue streams that strengthen financial sustainability and support ongoing capital improvements. National research shows these agreements create stable, long-term cash flow that helps fund operations and infrastructure while keeping facilities competitive and economically viable.

HRCC supports responsible investment in public infrastructure that creates jobs and ensures these facilities remain viable community assets.

For these reasons, the Hawai'i Regional Council of Carpenters respectfully urges the Committee to pass SB2074 HD2.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

STATE HEADQUARTERS & BUSINESS OFFICES

OAHU: 1311 Houghtailing Street, Honolulu Hawaii 96817-2712 • Ph. (808) 847-5761 Fax (808) 440-9188
HILO OFFICE: 525 Kilauea Avenue, Room 205, Hilo, Hawaii 96720-3050 • Ph. (808) 935-8575 Fax (808) 935-8576
KONA OFFICE: 75-126 Lunapule Road, Kailua-Kona, Hawaii 96740-2106 • Ph. (808) 329-7355 Fax (808) 326-9376
MAUI OFFICE: 330 Hookahi Street, Wailuku, Maui 96793-1449 • Ph. (808) 242-6891 Fax (808) 242-5961
KAUAI OFFICE: Kuhio Medical Ctr Bldg., 3-3295 Kuhio Hwy, Suite 201, Lihue, Kauai 96766-1040 • Ph. (808) 245-8511 Fax (808) 245-8911



April 3, 2026

House Committee on Finance
Hawai'i State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street, Room 306
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Committee Members:

As president of Scenic America — the nation's only 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated solely to preserving and promoting America's scenic beauty — **I urge you to vote against Senate Bill 2074**. This bill would, for the first time, authorize commercial outdoor advertising devices on the exterior of buildings in Hawai'i. That change represents a fundamental departure from the state's longstanding outdoor advertising prohibition.

For more than 40 years, Scenic America has championed policies that protect and enhance the beauty and character of our communities and the great outdoors. A key focus of our work is establishing clear limits on the spread of outdoor billboard advertising. We take this mission seriously — in one instance pursuing a case all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, where we prevailed.

Hawai'i is one of four states that have completely banned outdoor advertising. Its longstanding ban on outdoor advertising is a courageous stance against shortsighted commercialism — a stance that recognizes the astounding value of the state's natural beauty and the importance of smoothly integrating its urban settings with its pristine landscapes. The ban acknowledges that the state's aesthetics do so much more to promote the health and vitality of its citizens, its unique culture, and even its economy than outdoor advertising could ever hope to contribute. Furthermore, **this ban would homogenize Hawai'i with the mainland United States, erasing a defining distinction in exchange for the financial benefit of outdoor advertising companies.**

If Hawai'i were to open the door to any outdoor advertising, it would become extraordinarily difficult to close. In 1927, Hawai'i passed legislation to protect its neighborhoods, its night sky, and its public realm. Passing this legislation would move the state in the opposite direction — and not because residents asked for it.

As you consider these arguments against the bill, please also take into account the following evidence-based points about the impacts of outdoor advertising:

- **Economic burden:** While billboards may seem like an economic benefit, they primarily serve large national or multinational companies, offering little direct local economic value. This misalignment with local economic growth makes billboards an inefficient, counterproductive, and often harmful economic tactic. Conversely, tourism has been shown to increase in cities and states that have banned billboards, as community beautification attracts visitors and stimulates local economies.
- **Driver and pedestrian safety:** Numerous geospatial and neuroscience studies have shown that billboards, especially digital billboards, create distractions for drivers and lead to traffic accidents. For example, a 2020 review of 27 independent studies found that outdoor advertising signs are designed specifically to grab drivers' attention and divert it away from the roadway, contributing to distraction from both the road and pedestrians ahead.
- **Environmental degradation:** The erection of billboards requires substantial amounts of materials as well as the removal of trees and vegetation. Additionally, digital signs leave a large carbon footprint resulting from their significant consumption of electricity. LED signs and billboards also contribute to high levels of light pollution, disrupting nearby residents' sleep patterns and circadian rhythms as well as interfering with nocturnal animals' migration, movement, and foraging.

- **Socioeconomic implications:** Billboards are economic burdens for cities and communities. They contribute to regulatory and maintenance costs, decreased property values, and the loss of tourism revenue. It is a common misconception that billboards are economically advantageous to cities, as off-premises advertising primarily benefits large companies, with minimal direct economic contributions to local businesses.
- **Aesthetics and community character:** One of the most apparent impacts that billboards have on communities is the immediate decline of visual appeal. Billboards, often large and imposing, can dominate the landscape and distract from the natural beauty of the surroundings.

At Scenic America, we have concluded – based on robust research – that adding billboards benefits only the advertising companies that own them, while undermining the well-being and character of the communities that permit them. We respectfully urge the committee to reject Hawai'i Senate Bill 2074 and preserve the state's nationally and internationally admired prohibition on outdoor advertising.

If you have any questions or would like any additional information, please do not hesitate to reach out to me directly at mark.falzone@scenic.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Falzone". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Mark" and last name "Falzone" clearly distinguishable.

Mark Falzone
President, Scenic America



TESTIMONY OF DAVE ERDMAN
INTERIM PRESIDENT & CEO
RETAIL MERCHANTS OF HAWAI'I

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
Rep. Chris Todd, Chair
Rep. Jenna Takenouchi, Vice Chair

Tuesday, April 7, 2026
2:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308 & Videoconference

IN SUPPORT OF SB 2074, SD1, HD2 – RELATING TO STATE FACILITIES

Aloha Chair Todd, Vice Chair Takenouchi, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Dave Erdman, and I serve as Interim President and CEO of the Retail Merchants of Hawai'i (RMH), a statewide nonprofit trade association representing retailers, shopping centers, restaurants located in retail environments, and allied businesses across the islands.

Retail Merchants of Hawai'i supports SB 2074, SD1, HD2.

This measure provides important tools to strengthen the long-term financial sustainability of the Stadium Facility by allowing naming rights agreements, authorizing advertising and marketing revenue, exempting concessions from chapter 102 procurement requirements, and directing these revenues into the Stadium Development Special Fund. These provisions help establish a more flexible and market-driven operational model for the stadium and surrounding entertainment district.

Naming rights and sponsorship agreements are widely used across the country as part of the financial model for major stadiums and entertainment venues. These partnerships generate predictable, long-term revenue that supports operations, maintenance, and continued reinvestment while reducing reliance on public funding. The ability to display advertising, including on the exterior of the stadium as clarified in HD2, further strengthens the revenue potential of the facility.

A modern stadium and entertainment district serve as significant economic drivers. Large sporting events, concerts, and community gatherings attract residents and visitors who support nearby retailers, restaurants, and small businesses. Increased attendance at major events

translates into broader economic activity, including shopping, dining, transportation, and visitor spending throughout the region.

Providing flexibility for concessions within the stadium also supports a more dynamic visitor experience and allows local food, retail, and hospitality operators to participate in the stadium ecosystem. This can create additional opportunities for local businesses while improving overall guest satisfaction.

Retail Merchants of Hawai'i supports efforts that help create a financially sustainable stadium that contributes to economic growth, job creation, and increased business activity across multiple sectors, including retail and visitor-serving businesses.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify **in support**.

Respectfully submitted,
Dave Erdman
Interim President & CEO
Retail Merchants of Hawai'i

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 9:59:59 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Diane Harding	The Outdoor Circle	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I respectfully oppose SB2074 SD1 HD2.

This bill allows for large exterior advertising on a public facility, the Aloha Stadium, and marks a major and alarming departure from Hawai‘i’s longstanding protections against such signage.

Hawaii’s current protections regarding such outdoor advertising have had overwhelming public support for decades and have served to preserve Hawaii’s distinctive visual character so valued by residents and visitors alike.

Hawai‘i’s landscapes are a shared public trust and a defining part of our identity. They should not be compromised by commercial branding and the visual clutter this bill would introduce.

I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074 SD1 HD2.

Mahalo,

Diane Harding

President, The Outdoor Circle

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 4:51:09 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Barbara Ritchie	North Shore Outdoor Circle	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is part of our identity and economy. I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074.



Cade Watanabe, Financial Secretary-Treasurer

Gemma G. Weinstein, President

Eric W. Gill, Senior Vice-President

April 3, 2026

House Committee on Finance
Rep. Chris Todd, Chair
Rep. Jenna Takenouchi, Vice Chair

Testimony in Opposition to SB 2074

Chair Todd, Vice Chair Takenouchi, and Committee Members:

UNITE HERE Local 5 represents 10,000 working people in the hotel, food service and health care industries across Hawaii.

We strongly oppose the sections of this bill which would exempt concessions at the stadium from competitive bidding. There is no reason for these concessions to be added to the long and ever-growing list of things exempt from competitive bidding. Without competitive bidding, the process of awarding concessions contracts is opaque. This undermines the public's ability to monitor and provide input into the process. It will be unclear which companies are made aware of which opportunities. It will be unclear what standards are demanded of potential contractors. It will be unclear when contracts are being discussed or awarded. It will be unclear who is negotiating contracts and what connections they may have to potential contractors. It will be unclear what deals the State has negotiated until after contracts are signed, and only to the extent public records are made available.

Competitive bidding exemptions make the system vulnerable to corruption.

We ask that you remove Section 1 of the bill, and the proposed language in part §109-__ (a) from SB 2074.

With regard to naming rights, it is unclear from this bill how the stadium authority would award the lease of the stadium naming rights. Though the names hypothesized in recent news articles have been innocuous enough, we certainly would not want to end up with a stadium named after a person or entity that either now or in the future is associated with serious crimes, becomes widely hated, becomes symbolic of bad qualities, etc. This is a reality that many institutions and organizations are currently grappling with.

Thank you.



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Diane Harding
President

Maureen Murphy
Vice President

Denise Soderholm
Treasurer

Whitney Bosel
Secretary

Cheryl Langton
Branch Representative

Beverley Brand
Advisor

Joan Gossett
Advisor

Jonathan Sudler
Advisor

Directors:

Tyler Dang

Brenda Lam

Jack O'Neill

BRANCHES

Hawai'i

East Hawai'i

Kona

Waikoloa Village

Waimea

Kaua'i

O'ahu

East Honolulu

Lani-Kailua

Mānoa

North Shore

Greater Waikiki

STAFF

Winston Welch
Executive Director

Jacqueline Wah
Operations Director

Myles Ritchie, PhD
Programs Director

Keeping Hawai'i clean,
green and beautiful
since 1912

March 31, 2026

RE: SB2074 SD1 HD2 STRONG OPPOSITION – RELATING TO STATE FACILITIES

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

The Outdoor Circle, founded in 1912, respectfully submits this testimony in strong opposition to SB2074 SD1 HD2.

This bill has evolved significantly as it has moved through the legislative process. It is no longer reasonably described as a naming rights measure. In its current form, it authorizes commercial advertising on the exterior of a state-owned facility, exempts concessions from chapter 102 procurement safeguards, directs advertising and marketing revenues into a special fund, and amends Hawai'i's general outdoor advertising law, all under the title "Relating to State Facilities," which does not reflect the scope of what is actually being done.

The most significant change in the current version is the removal of language that had confined exterior signage to the name of the naming rights entity. That provision was the only basis on which this bill could be characterized as identification rather than advertising. With it removed, what remains is an open-ended authorization for commercial advertising on the exterior of a major public facility, with no statutory limits on size, brightness, movement, content, or visibility from surrounding public roads.

I. Hawai'i's Deliberate Choice About Outdoor Advertising

Hawai'i's approach to outdoor advertising is not accidental. It is the product of deliberate public decisions made over more than a century, decisions that have been defended, reaffirmed, and upheld in court.

In the early decades of the twentieth century, Diamond Head, the Pali, and Punchbowl were covered in commercial signage. The rapid spread of billboard advertising was precisely what led to the formation of The Outdoor Circle in 1912. After years of sustained public advocacy, the last billboard company operating in Hawai'i was purchased and dismantled in 1927. The Legislature subsequently codified the prohibition on outdoor advertising, establishing in statute the principle that Hawai'i's visual environment would not be treated as commercial inventory.

That history matters here because this was not a passive or incidental development. It was a conscious public choice, made over decades, that Hawai'i's landscapes and public spaces belonged to the people and should not be commercialized. That choice has been sustained through more than a century of legislative sessions, legal challenges, and public debate. HRS § 445-111 establishes the governing prohibition: "No person shall erect, maintain, or use a billboard or any other outdoor advertising device." Section 445-112 establishes a limited set of statutory exceptions to that prohibition, each one carefully bounded by specific statutory constraints. SB2074 SD1 HD2 would add a new exception with none of those constraints.

This is not a technical provision. It is a foundational statement about who Hawai'i is and how it manages its public spaces. For this Committee in particular, it is worth noting that Hawai'i's visual environment is itself an economic asset. Visitors do not come to Hawai'i to

1314 S. King Street #306 | Honolulu, Hawai'i 96814

T: 808-593-0300 | mail@outdoorcircle.org | www.outdoorcircle.org

encounter the same commercial landscape they see everywhere else. They come because it is different. Hawai'i's strict advertising laws have contributed to rather than cost the State revenue, and the tourism economy that depends on an uncluttered visual environment is a Finance Committee concern as much as it is an environmental one.

II. Courts Have Upheld This Approach, But Consistency Is the Condition

Hawai'i's restrictions on outdoor advertising have been tested in court and upheld. That record of success is not incidental. It reflects careful, consistent application of recognized legal principles. This bill introduces a contradiction into that framework that will not be easily contained.

The foundational Hawai'i case is *State v. Diamond Motors, Inc.*, in which the Hawai'i Supreme Court articulated the governing principle directly:

“We accept beauty as a proper community objective,
attainable through the use of the police power.”

The court grounded that principle in the Hawai'i Constitution, which authorizes the State to conserve and protect its natural beauty and regulate private property for that purpose. That is not a peripheral legal doctrine. It is the constitutional foundation on which over a century of signage law rests.

Federal courts have reached the same conclusion.

In *Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego*, 453 U.S. 490 (1981), the United States Supreme Court held that “traffic safety and the appearance of the city are substantial governmental goals” justifying restrictions on outdoor advertising.

In *Members of City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent*, 466 U.S. 789 (1984), the Court recognized that visual clutter itself constitutes a cognizable harm that government may act to prevent.

These decisions rest on a common principle: the regulation of outdoor advertising serves legitimate public interests that courts will respect. But that deference also carries an implicit condition. The State's ability to enforce these restrictions depends on taking a coherent and consistent position. A government that prohibits outdoor advertising in general, while simultaneously authorizing it wherever doing so is financially advantageous, faces a fundamentally different and more difficult legal posture than one that applies its rules consistently. This does not merely introduce policy tension. It creates a litigation posture in which the State may be required to defend a regulatory framework that it is actively undermining through its own statutory exceptions.

SB2074 SD1 HD2 introduces exactly that inconsistency. The State would be asserting that outdoor advertising is harmful in general, harmful enough to prohibit statewide, while carving out an exception for a commercially valuable public facility. That selective application is the kind of precedent that places the State in a position where it may be required to defend a regulatory framework it is actively undermining through its own statutory exceptions.

There is a second dimension to this inconsistency that deserves the Committee's attention. By authorizing and deriving revenue from commercial messaging on its own facilities, the State moves from the position of a neutral regulator of advertising to that of an active participant in it. The State would be selecting specific commercial partners and associations for its publicly owned buildings — buildings that carry the implicit imprimatur of the State itself. That is a fundamentally different institutional posture than prohibiting private parties from advertising, and it raises questions about selective endorsement that are not addressed

1314 S. King Street #306 | Honolulu, Hawai'i 96814

T: 808-593-0300 | mail@outdoorcircle.org | www.outdoorcircle.org

anywhere in this bill. This transforms the State's role from regulator to participant in commercial messaging in a manner that carries the implicit authority and endorsement of the State itself.

III. What This Bill Has Become: The Removal of the Only Meaningful Limit

The evolution of this bill through the legislative process is the central issue before this Committee.

The HD1 version of SB2074 included the following sentence in new § 445-112(19): "An outdoor advertising device displayed under this paragraph shall be limited to the name of any entity that leased the naming rights of the stadium from the stadium authority." That language was not a secondary detail. It was the provision that confined the bill to identification — the name of the entity holding naming rights — rather than open advertising. It was the answer to the question of what would actually appear on the exterior of the building.

The HD2 version removes that sentence in its entirety.

What paragraph (19) says in the current version, in full, is this:

"Any outdoor advertising device, displayed with the authorization of the stadium authority, on the exterior of any stadium operated by the stadium authority."

That is the complete provision. There is no limit on what can be displayed. There is no limit on size, brightness, illumination, movement, or frequency of change. There is no requirement that advertising face the interior of the facility. There is no restriction on visibility from public roads. There is no brightness standard, no operational-hours limit, no public-notice requirement, no rulemaking process, and no oversight mechanism. The discretion granted to the stadium authority is entirely unconstrained by statute.

The bill's own description confirms that the change was intentional. The HD1 description read: "Authorizes the display of the name of any entity that leased the naming rights to a stadium operated by the Stadium Authority on the exterior of the stadium." The HD2 description reads: "Authorizes the display of an outdoor advertising device on the exterior of a stadium operated by the Stadium Authority." The naming-rights limitation is gone from the description as well.

This is not a gap in drafting. It is the structure of the bill as it now stands. And because these authorizations would be implemented through contractual arrangements and physical installations, the absence of statutory standards is not easily remedied after the fact. The State's ability to impose new restrictions once rights have been granted is inherently limited.

IV. The Bill Establishes Multiple Independent Advertising Authorizations

The advertising authorization in this bill is not confined to the amendment to chapter 445. Section 2 of the bill adds a new section to chapter 109, the Stadium Authority statute. Subsection (c) of that new section provides: "Any revenues derived from advertising or marketing in or on the stadium facility, including revenues derived under subsection (b), shall be deposited into the stadium development special fund under section 109-3.5." This is a freestanding authorization for advertising and marketing revenues in chapter 109, separate from and independent of the chapter 445 amendment. It carries no reference to the constraints of § 445-112. Even if limitations were later introduced into § 445-112(19), section 2(c) would remain as a separate statutory basis for unrestricted advertising revenue. The bill establishes not one but two independent paths to the same outcome, in two different statutory schemes, under a single title that discloses neither. This dual structure makes it difficult to constrain the authorization through amendment of any single provision.

V. This Bill Raises a Serious Constitutional Concern

Article III, section 14 of the Hawai'i Constitution provides: "Each law shall embrace but one subject, which shall be expressed in its title."

The title of this bill is "A Bill for an Act Relating to State Facilities." The bill does considerably more than that. It authorizes commercial advertising on public property and amends Hawai'i's general outdoor advertising law, which regulates commercial speech statewide and has nothing to do with "state facilities" as an administrative or statutory category. Neither of those objectives is fairly expressed in the title.

Proponents may point to the report title at the end of the bill, which does reference "Advertising; Marketing." That argument should be anticipated and addressed directly. The report title is a legislative drafting and indexing tool. It is not the constitutional title of the act. The single-subject requirement refers to the title of the law as enacted — the one that appears at the top of the bill and that members of the public would encounter in any summary or description of the legislation. The purpose of the rule is to ensure that both legislators and the public are fairly apprised of what a bill does. A title "Relating to State Facilities" does not put a reasonable reader on notice that the State's outdoor advertising law is being altered. If the title requirement cannot be enforced in circumstances such as this, it provides little meaningful constraint on how legislation is structured.

Section 4 of the bill reinforces this concern. It amends chapter 445, which governs outdoor advertising statewide. Chapter 445 is not a facilities statute. It is the State's general commercial advertising framework, applicable to all persons and all locations. Amending it through a bill titled "Relating to State Facilities" raises a direct single-subject question: are these two things the same subject?

This concern is not novel and has already been identified by the State, and it did not originate with The Outdoor Circle. In testimony before the House Committee on Finance on March 28, 2025, the Department of the Attorney General stated that SB583 HD1, a substantially similar predecessor to this bill, was "[s]ubject to challenge under the single subject requirement of section 14 of article III of the State Constitution," specifically identifying the advertising and marketing revenue provisions as the basis for that concern. SB2074 presents the same structural problem, and then expands on it by also directly amending chapter 445. The Legislature is being asked to advance a measure that its own Attorney General identified as constitutionally vulnerable — on the same grounds — one session ago.

VI. Existing Law Shows the Legislature Knows How to Write These Constraints

What existing law already does with respect to stadium advertising is directly relevant here, because the contrast with SB2074 is not subtle.

Paragraphs (16) and (17) of § 445-112 govern advertising at University of Hawai'i stadiums. Paragraph (16) permits advertising on UH scoreboards, but specifies: "An outdoor advertising device displayed under this paragraph shall be on the front of the scoreboard and face the interior of the stadium." Paragraph (17) permits temporary advertising at UH stadiums, but requires that it be "located within and facing the interior of the stadium." Paragraph (20), governing the Waipio Peninsula soccer stadium, goes further still: it specifies exact dimensional limits, requires the scoreboard to be no larger than 28 feet by 10 feet, and mandates that the advertising device "shall not be visible from any thoroughfare."

Every advertising exception the Legislature has created in § 445-112 comes with specific statutory constraints. Interior-facing requirements, dimensional limits, and visibility restrictions were not included by accident. They reflect a deliberate legislative judgment that exceptions to Hawai'i's advertising prohibition should be narrow and bounded.

1314 S. King Street #306 | Honolulu, Hawai'i 96814

T: 808-593-0300 | mail@outdoorcircle.org | www.outdoorcircle.org

New paragraph (19) has none of those constraints. The Legislature is not being asked to add a new exception in the same disciplined tradition it has followed for every other exception in this section. It is being asked to add an exception that breaks with that tradition entirely.

VII. Displacement of Established Land Use Regulation

Issues such as the size, placement, illumination, and visibility of signage are typically addressed through county land use and zoning frameworks, including, in Honolulu, the Land Use Ordinance, which establishes detailed standards governing signage through public process.

Those frameworks include limitations on scale, brightness, and location, as well as procedures for review and public input, reflecting long-standing local regulation of how visual elements are integrated into surrounding communities.

SB2074 SD1 HD2 authorizes exterior advertising on a state facility without reference to those frameworks and without incorporating comparable standards. The result is the authorization of a use outside the structure through which such impacts have traditionally been evaluated and regulated.

VIII. Traffic Safety

The connection between sign regulation and traffic safety is both legally established and practically significant in this context.

Courts have long recognized that signs compete for driver attention. That recognition was central to the Supreme Court's acceptance of traffic safety as a substantial governmental interest in *Metromedia*, 453 U.S. at 507–08. Research published by the Federal Highway Administration has documented that dynamic, illuminated, and rapidly changing signs produce driver fixation durations that exceed the two-second threshold considered safe for eyes-off-road time.

The stadium site in Hālawā is located adjacent to the H-1 Freeway, one of the most heavily traveled roadways in the State. SB2074 SD1 HD2 would permit exterior advertising displays on this highly visible structure without any limits on motion, brightness, frequency of change, or orientation toward the roadway. There is no requirement for a traffic safety study before installation. There is no requirement for any mitigation measures. There is no process through which the Department of Transportation or any other agency could establish standards after the fact without additional legislation.

The absence of any statutory standard addressing driver distraction in a location directly adjacent to the H-1 Freeway is not a minor omission. It is a central feature of the bill.

VIII. Light Pollution and Federal Environmental Exposure

Large illuminated exterior displays generate light that extends significantly beyond the facility. The residential communities near the stadium site, including Salt Lake, Hālawā, and 'Aiea, would be directly affected by nighttime lighting from any exterior display permitted under this bill. There are no standards in the bill addressing brightness, permissible direction of illumination, or operational hours. Once the authorization is established, there is no statutory mechanism through which neighboring residents could seek limits.

Hawai'i has dealt directly with the documented impacts of artificial light on native wildlife. The Save Our Shearwaters program, operated on Kaua'i, exists because artificial lighting causes native seabirds, including the Newell's Shearwater and the Hawaiian Petrel, both federally listed, to become disoriented during flight, causing them to crash-land in large numbers. The problem is well-documented, ongoing, and the subject of active management programs across the state.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 703–712, prohibits the taking of protected migratory birds, including species found in Hawai‘i. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has identified artificial lighting as a recognized contributing factor in bird mortality events cognizable under the MBTA. A large illuminated display on the exterior of a major public facility, operated without any restrictions on hours or brightness, creates a documented federal legal risk that this bill does not acknowledge or address.

IX. Financial Risk and Long-Term Obligations

The Department of Budget and Finance raised a specific financial concern about SB583 in testimony before the House Committee on Finance on March 28, 2025. That concern applies with full force here:

“B&F has serious concerns that payments for naming rights for improvements financed by tax-exempt bonds will be considered private business use under the Internal Revenue Code. Federal tax law imposes restrictions on the private use of the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds and on the capital improvement projects financed with such proceeds. Failure to comply with federal rules on the private use of bond proceeds and bond-financed property could jeopardize the tax-exempt status of the bonds, resulting in significant adverse consequences to bondholders or forcing the State to incur costly measures to remediate the tax law violations.”

B&F noted that the new stadium is being financed with taxable bonds, which reduces the immediate exposure for this specific facility. But the precedent this bill establishes will not remain confined to the new stadium. The Convention Center, addressed in prior versions of related legislation and financed in part with tax-exempt bonds, is among the facilities to which this framework will logically extend. The financial risk identified by B&F travels with the precedent, not just with the immediate application.

There is a second financial concern that is less technical but equally significant. Naming rights agreements and associated advertising arrangements are typically structured as multi-year or long-term contracts. Once executed, they are difficult and often prohibitively expensive to unwind. Future administrations and future generations may be legally bound by branding and commercial arrangements made today, with limited practical ability to reverse course regardless of public sentiment at the time.

X. The Public Record on This Question Is Not Ambiguous

The Legislature has now considered versions of this legislation across three consecutive sessions. The public record across those sessions is consistent and unambiguous.

A Star-Advertiser “Big Q” poll in January 2024 asked readers whether they supported a billboard-ban exemption. Eighty-three percent of respondents answered no. That was not a close result.

SB3197, the 2024 version of this legislation, received unanimous public opposition in Senate testimony. Not one member of the public testified in favor of advancing it.

SB583, the 2025 version, generated the same pattern. The Department of the Attorney General, the Department of Budget and Finance, and The Outdoor Circle all submitted opposition testimony raising substantive legal and financial concerns. No meaningful public support was recorded.

This bill does not arise from a groundswell of public demand for change. It runs against a well-established, durable, and cross-session public consensus that Hawai‘i’s outdoor advertising laws should be maintained and strengthened, not weakened. The Committee should weigh that record carefully.

XI. Alternatives Exist

The Outdoor Circle recognizes that public facilities require revenue to operate and maintain. That recognition does not change our position on this bill, because the question before the Committee is not whether revenue support for public facilities is possible. It is whether it should be pursued in a manner that carries the legal, constitutional, and policy risks described in this testimony.

Public facilities in Hawai'i already receive private support through sponsorship, partnership, and donor-recognition models that do not require altering the visual environment or creating new legal exposure. The University of Hawai'i receives substantial philanthropic contributions while maintaining its public identity. The Adopt-a-Park program, bequests of property, gifts of equipment, and direct contributions to state and county agencies all represent existing mechanisms through which private support flows to public assets without requiring changes to Hawai'i's advertising laws.

If corporations and individuals genuinely wish to support Hawai'i's public facilities, they can do so in ways that do not require the purchase of naming rights or the placement of commercial advertising on the exterior of public buildings. Those alternatives deserve consideration before the Legislature takes an effectively irreversible step.

XII. This Bill Will Not Remain Facility-Specific

SB2074 SD1 HD2 is presented as specific to one facility. Based on the logic of the authorization and the legislative history of similar measures in other jurisdictions, it will not remain that way.

Once the State authorizes open-ended commercial advertising on one major public facility without meaningful limits, the legal and political basis for rejecting similar proposals for other facilities becomes significantly more difficult to sustain. The same arguments — revenue needs, voluntary authority, limited initial scope — will be made for the Convention Center, for airports, for transit-oriented developments, and for other state-owned assets. Having accepted the framework once, the Legislature will find it increasingly difficult to distinguish or defend distinctions why the same framework should not apply elsewhere.

This is precisely how long-standing protective frameworks erode — not through a single decisive change, but through incremental decisions that, taken individually, appear manageable and, taken together, transform the underlying policy. Hawai'i's visual environment is the result of over a century of deliberate restraint. That restraint reflects a consistent public judgment that the economic and cultural value of Hawai'i's landscapes exceeds what can be recovered through commercial advertising. That judgment is not easily restored once the restraint is relaxed.

XIII. Conclusion

SB2074 SD1 HD2 is not a naming rights measure. The naming-rights limitation was the only provision that distinguished this bill from a straightforward advertising authorization. It has been removed.

What remains authorizes commercial advertising on the exterior of a major public facility without meaningful statutory limits; introduces inconsistency into Hawai'i's outdoor advertising framework in a manner that undermines the State's ability to defend that framework in court; raises a constitutional single-subject concern that the State's own Attorney General identified on a substantially similar bill one session ago; moves the State from the position of neutral regulator to active commercial participant on its own facilities; creates federal exposure under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; presents bond-compliance risks identified by the Department of Budget and Finance; establishes a precedent that will not remain confined to this facility; and binds future administrations to long-term commercial arrangements with no clear mechanism for reversal.

1314 S. King Street #306 | Honolulu, Hawai'i 96814

T: 808-593-0300 | mail@outdoorcircle.org | www.outdoorcircle.org

Hawai'i has spent more than a century making a deliberate choice that its public landscapes and spaces are not for sale. The Outdoor Circle has been part of that effort since 1912. This bill asks the Legislature to begin unwinding that choice — without public support, without adequate safeguards, and under a bill title that does not disclose what is actually being done.

For these reasons, The Outdoor Circle respectfully urges the Committee to defer SB2074 SD1 HD2.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

Winston Welch
Executive Director
The Outdoor Circle

LATE *Testimony submitted late may not be considered by the Committee for decision making purposes.



AVALON
DEVELOPMENT

Queen's Court
800 Bethel Street, Suite 501
Honolulu HI 96813

Phone 808.587.7770
Fax 808.587.7769
www.avalonhi.com

**TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SB 2074, SD1, HD2
RELATING TO STATE FACILITIES**

Dear Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Committee:

Avalon Development Company LLC submits this testimony in support of SB 2074, SD1, HD2. This measure represents a prudent and fiscally responsible approach to strengthening the long-term financial sustainability of the State's major public facilities by authorizing the Stadium Authority to lease naming rights and generate advertising and marketing revenues. These market-based revenue tools allow the State to better leverage high-value public assets while maintaining public ownership and oversight. Similar arrangements nationwide have demonstrated that naming rights agreements can generate stable, predictable revenue streams that support ongoing operations, maintenance, and capital improvements, reducing reliance on general funds or future taxpayer support.

To ensure this policy operates as intended for the New Aloha Stadium, we respectfully recommend a targeted amendment clarifying the destination of these revenues. Under the Stadium Authority's public-private partnership structure, operational responsibility and revenue flows are assigned to the stadium operator. Directing naming rights, advertising, and marketing proceeds to the operator's capital improvement fund, rather than the stadium development special fund, would better align with the project's financing and maintenance framework. This adjustment would help avoid the deferred maintenance issues that affected the former facility and ensure that revenues generated by the stadium are reinvested directly into its long-term upkeep and viability. For these reasons, Avalon Development Company LLC supports SB 2074, SD1 HD2HD1 with the proposed amendment and respectfully urges its adoption.

Respectfully submitted,

Avalon Development Company LLC



April 7, 2026

Representative Chris Todd, Chair
Representative Jenna Takenouchi, Vice Chair
House Committee on Finance

Strong Support of SB 2074 SD1, HD2, RELATING TO STATE FACILITIES (Exempts concessions within the Stadium Facility from chapter 102, HRS. Allows the naming rights of the Stadium Facility to be leased to any public or private entity. Requires any revenues derived from advertising or marketing in or on the Stadium Facility to be deposited into the Stadium Development Special Fund. Authorizes the display of an outdoor advertising device on the exterior of a stadium operated by the Stadium Authority. Effective 7/1/3000. [HD2])

Finance Committee Hearing: Tuesday, April 7, 2026, at 2:00 p.m.
State Capitol, Conference Room 308, & VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

The Land Use Research Foundation of Hawaii (LURF) is a private research and trade organization originally founded in 1979, whose members include major Hawaii landowners, developers, real estate investment trusts, utility companies, and land use professionals. LURF's mission is to research, educate, and advocate for reasonable, rational, and equitable land use planning, laws, and regulations that encourage well-planned and sustainable economic growth, agriculture, housing, renewable energy, commercial and industrial uses, health care, and tourism, while safeguarding Hawaii's significant natural, environmental, historic, and cultural resources, public health, and safety.

LURF is in **strong support of SB 2074 SD1, HD2.**

LURF Position. Exempting Stadium concessions from Chapter 102, HRS is important because the Hawaii procurement law and its procurement and leasing requirements were not designed for high-volume, event-based concession operations and can limit flexibility, delay contracting, and reduce competitiveness. The exemption will allow the Stadium Authority to be competitive with Mainland and other venues, negotiate modern, market-responsive concession agreements, adapt quickly to consumer demand, and align stadium operations with industry standards, which can maximize concession revenues while reducing administrative and compliance costs.

Allowing naming rights, modern advertising and marketing opportunities, and flexibility for concessions will allow the Stadium Authority to remain competitive in the major sports venue marketplace and also help create sustainable funding streams without increasing the burden on taxpayers.

From a fiscal perspective, the increased efficiency and economic opportunities of the Chapter 102 procurement exemption and allowing monetizing of naming rights for the Hawai'i's stadium creates revenue-generating capacity that can help strengthen the Stadium Development Special Fund and reduce reliance on General Fund support. Requiring the concession leasing and naming rights revenues to be deposited into the Stadium Development Special Fund ensures transparency, accountability and that funds are reinvested directly into stadium operations and infrastructure.

This measure allows for fiscally responsible management, public-private partnerships, and mixed-use business and community opportunities that can serve as an example to encourage ongoing sustainable major sports and entertainment venues in Hawai'i.

Based on the reasons stated above, LURF is in strong support of **SB 2074 SD1, HD2**, and respectfully requests your favorable consideration of this bill.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments in support of this measure.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 10:44:05 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mark Bogart	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is part of our identity and economy. I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 11:14:56 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ruth Holmberg	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Please don't dilute the current signage laws! I am deeply concerned that this change will establish a precedent that will eliminate the legal protections currently in place. Hawaii is one of the few forward thinking states with an understanding of the importance of protecting the visual environment. I do not want to follow states like Texas, California, or Nevada where roadways and streets are full of billboards and moving fluorescent advertising. I want to be retain the beauty of our Aloha State where everyone, especially our legislative representatives, appreciates the importance of the law that protects us from visual distraction and intrusion. Visitors frequently remark on this unique feature of Hawaii. Please do not let SB 2074 move forward.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/2/2026 4:21:45 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marcia Kemble	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Greetings Committee Members,

I am writing in strong opposition to SB2074 SD1 HD1, which would allow exterior corporate branding on the Stadium Facility, a public facility. Please, please, PLEASE preserve the strong protections against outdoor advertising that we have had in Hawaii for nearly a century.

Allowing corporate branding on public facilities could begin a slippery slope of this practice proliferating. So much of the beauty we take for granted is due to the prohibitions against billboards and large advertising/commercial signage. The revenue savings of this measure are just really, really not worth the cost in terms of losing protections of our land and community from the heavy stamp of commercialization.

Mahalo for your consideration.

Marcia Kemble

Makiki

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/3/2026 10:48:36 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

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

Comments:

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

I am writing today to express my **strong opposition** to SB2074. The previous committee has made a bad bill absolutely catastrophic.

The original version of this bill was already concerning. It authorized the display of corporate names and advertising on the exterior of the new stadium facility. I testified then that I had less objection to leasing naming rights—"First Hawaiian Bank Arena," "Hawaiian Airlines Field"—because that is a familiar and acceptable part of modern sports facility financing. It happens in cities across the country, and it can generate meaningful revenue without completely selling out our community character.

But the previous committee has now done something truly heinous.

What the Previous Committee Did

The original bill at least contained one small guardrail: it limited outdoor advertising displayed on the exterior of the stadium to the name of the entity that leased the naming rights. A single name. One corporation. No logos, no slogans, no digital billboards, no visual blight.

The previous committee deleted that language entirely. It removed the only provision that kept this bill from being a blank check for corporate visual pollution. Without that guardrail, SB2074 now authorizes the Stadium Authority to plaster the exterior of our new stadium with any and all advertising it sees fit. Logos. Slogans. Rotating digital billboards. Giant video screens. Multiple corporate names. Whatever generates the most revenue, with no regard for what it does to the visual environment of our community.

This is not a slippery slope anymore. The previous committee kicked the pebble over the edge and watched it tumble into an abyss.

What This Bill Now Does

SB2074 as amended is a turbocharged assault on Hawai'i's natural beauty. It authorizes the display of corporate names and advertising on the exterior of the stadium with no meaningful limits. The Stadium Authority could cover the entire facade in rotating digital advertisements.

They could sell every inch of exterior space to the highest bidder. They could turn our new stadium into a Las Vegas-style billboard, visible from miles away, blasting corporate messages into our neighborhoods.

And here is the kicker: this bill now works in concert with SB2353, which separately seeks to authorize digital billboards and exterior advertising. Together, these two bills represent a coordinated one-two punch against the visual character of our islands. First, they crack the door open. Then, they kick it off its hinges.

Shame on the previous committee for advancing this monstrosity.

Why This Matters

Hawai‘i has long resisted the commercialization of our public spaces. We do not have highways lined with billboards. We do not have buildings plastered with advertisements. That is intentional. That is who we are. Our sense of place—our ability to look at the landscape without a corporate logo interrupting every view—is part of what makes these islands home.

The previous committee seems to have forgotten that. Or worse, they have chosen to abandon it.

I understand the Stadium Authority needs revenue. But there is a difference between responsible revenue generation and opening the door to visual blight. Naming rights are responsible. Exterior advertising is not. And the previous committee has now removed the only safeguard that kept exterior advertising in check.

I respectfully urge this committee to **kill this bill**. If that is not possible, then at least restore the language to its previous iteration in which the state at least limited exterior advertising to the name of the naming rights entity.

Let us fund our stadium without selling out the character of our community. The previous committee failed that test. I hope you will not.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 11:55:53 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Brett Kurashige	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair Hagan, Vice Chair Hussey, and Committee Members:

I am submitting testimony in strong opposition to S.B. 2074, S.D. 1, which would allow billboard signage on the exterior of the to-be-built Stadium Facility.

I am not opposed to allowing these types of billboard signs within the stadium walls itself, but **NOT outdoors or external to the facility structure.**

Let's continue to preserve and nurture our Hawaiian history, places and heritage, and our outdoor public spaces and facilities. Organizations such as thre Outdoor Circle continue to champion this cause, and keep Hawaii beautiful, without excessive urban visual blight. The State of Hawaii should continue to set a good community example with all State facilities abiding by the "no commercial bill boards" approach.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 12:30:34 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Joan C Gossett	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I strongly OPPOSE SB2074. Hawaii has had sign laws in place for decades for a reason. Having advertising in your face all the time is intrusive and rude. Never mind REALLY ugly. Additionally, this bill is flawed, as there are no indications of allowable sizes, so we are looking at the reality of billboards ...again. Really? Is this where you want to take us? 'A'ole!

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 12:34:47 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Craig Gorsuch	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully and strongly oppose SB2074. The residents of Hawai‘i have made a clear and deliberate, century-long decision not to allow our public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill departs from that longstanding approach by permitting large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility—without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility.

This change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a dangerous precedent that could extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is central to our identity, cultural values, and economic vitality.

For these reasons, I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 12:36:42 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Randolph Moore	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

My name is Randy Moore, and I write in opposition to the following provision on page 8 of the subject bill that would amend Section 445-112, HRS by adding a new paragraph 19 to read:

(19) Any outdoor advertising device, displayed with the authorization of the stadium authority, on the exterior of any stadium operated by the stadium authority

Hawai‘i has been blessed by having banned the more obnoxious forms of outdoor advertising for more than a century. There is no good reason to make an exception for the new stadium at Halawa. The argument that it will be financially beneficial to the Stadium Authority, by assuming that a sponsor paying for the naming rights to the facility would pay more if its sponsorship could be broadcast to the general public via exterior advertising, is an argument that could be extended to any other public facility with a private name on it.

How much more would the University of Hawai‘i have received from Bank of Hawai‘i if the bank had been allowed to erect large signs visible from University Avenue and the H-1 freeway in both directions advertising the “Bankoh Arena at Stan Sheriff Center?”

Not a good idea at all.

Mahalo for your consideration.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 2:26:07 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Millicent Cox	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I strongly oppose SB2074. My great grandmother was one of the original ladies who worked to protect Hawaii's vital scenery that today make Hawaii different from other places.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 2:31:09 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Alexander Ress	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

If SB2704 succeeds, we take a sharp turn down a road that allows speech in places where – up until now – the State has lawfully restricted it. The restrictions are legal because Hawai‘i treats all speech (commercial, political, religious) the same. If we treat some speech differently, as SB2704 proposes, we may regret it.

Hawaii’s existing law arose from longstanding efforts to keep Hawai‘i clean, green, and beautiful, and it has survived constitutional challenges in court. Who challenged these laws? People who wanted to put up billboards on our roadways and fly banners towed by airplanes along Waikiki beach with messages ranging from product advertisements to marriage proposals to campaign slogans to pictures of mutilated fetuses. Why did these challenges fail? They failed because Hawai‘i law restricted **all** speech in favor of Hawaii’s natural beauty, including its interest in preserving its unmarred skies and clear views of the mountains and ocean.

If Hawai‘i changes the law, the battles fought and won as recently as the late 1990s and early 2000s, may have to be fought again. Allowing the advertising and marketing proposed by SB2704 will make it difficult to defend against such challenges. As a consequence, Hawai‘i might come to look more like places on the continent besieged by billboards and banners.

Speech is critically important to society. But so are other constitutionally protected interests. Hawai‘i knocked it out of the park in striking a legal balance between competing constitutional interests. Let’s not risk changing a law that makes us the envy of so many other places.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 2:42:49 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Diane Anderson	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I absolutley OPPOSE SB 2074. The protection of Hawaii's scenic visual landscape is one of our most VALUABLE asset in our State. and we are counting on you to keep commercial advertizing off our exterior public buildings,

Please Say NO. Please Vote NO.

Please resist the commercialization and advertizing sign pollution on the exterior of our publice buildings. Please continue to show your respect for all the hard work done by so many in our state over the past decades to protect our visual environment. WE are trusting you to not cave in to the advertizing giants for money and sell out Hawaii;s miost treasured beauty of our landscape. No amount of money should override the protection of the beauty of our state. Thank you.

Sincerely Diane Anderson

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 3:44:26 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Robbie Berkstresser	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is part of our identity and economy. I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 3:44:58 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Betsy Connors	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments: I vigorously oppose this SB 2074. It represents a persistent effort to destroy Hawaii's sign regulations that protect the visual environment of our community. Every year, the motion is put forth and every year, the community says "no." The bill's sole purpose is to make money for businesses and corporations that are already making plenty profits. And the distractions such signage will cause are also a traffic safety concerns. No, to this bill again and again and again.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 3:47:51 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lori Lloyd	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Stop SB2074, I oppose this bill. We the people of Hawai‘i have not allowed commercial, for profit, advertising in our public spaces that mar our beautiful landscapes for one hundred years. This bill is trying to change our residents expectation that we will not be subjected to large, highly visible exterior advertising on public facilities. Why would we want signage with no limits on content, size, brightness, movement that obstruct and distract from our beloved scenic beauty and create distraction that leads to accidents on our already overcrowded roadways. Do not allow this bill to go forward, it establishes a precedent that will allow more commercial advertising to proliferate across our islands. Once this dam bursts it will be difficult to stop the flood and clean it up...again. Tax paying citizens depend on our Hawai‘i's natural environment, it is who we are and supports our tropical economy. Please stop SB2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 6:15:16 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marsha Schweitzer	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

PLEASE OPPOSE SB 2074 SD1 HD2

Businesses have their own advertising networks and media. They do not need government assistance. If the government wants more revenue from businesses, it should come through taxation, land leases, or other such established vehicles, not through advertising. Branding a public building with a particular company's name or logo shows favoritism toward that business and puts other businesses at a disadvantage. This should not happen in the public sector. Government is meant to serve ALL the people fairly and equitably.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 7:02:11 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Vera	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is part of our identity and economy. I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 8:31:24 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Diana Duff	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is part of our identity and economy. I oppose SB2074.

Diana Duff

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/4/2026 8:48:45 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David White	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill. As a citizen of this State I have a full appreciation for the lack of commercial signage that distracts and detracts from the beauty of our landscape. In the city and towns, our residents benefit from minimal advertising. Advertising at a scale that attracts a passerby, distracts from the local environment. Advertising that attracts a motorist would be an unwelcome intrusion that benefits a small minority of viewers.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 6:56:03 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Malia Kamisugi	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Hawaii is a special place, and that is due in part to the fact we have not allowed billboards or other large signage to exist. Allowing the stadium such an exemption would be the start of a very slippery slope regarding signage and turning Hawaii in to something no one wants to see.

In addition, our drivers are already extremely distracted, and large illuminated signage near the freeway would add to this issue.

Please do not allow this to happen!

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 9:42:42 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
anne zellinger	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

One only needs to travel to other US states to see the blight on the landscape of this kind of advertising. Hawaii's natural beauty is what raises our spirits and those who visit the islands. Putting this in jeopardy is not worth it, monetarily or spiritually.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 1:39:32 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Nina Reppun Carney	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose SB2074. Please do not allow commercial advertising on our public buildings, facilities and spaces! This bill cancels out our longheld prohibition of "billboards". It may be mainland style but let's respect our "local style" and instead leave the law as is. Please don't do it.

Aloha, Nina

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 2:13:33 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Cynthia Gillette-Wenner	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully, and fully, oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i's visual environment is part of our identity and economy.

One of the greatest aspects of returning home to Hawaii is to no long be bombarded with all the advertising signs, large and small, that cover the landscapes of mainland, as well as foriegn, locations....what an eyesore! We are beautiful, small islands and cannot support that kind of signage.

I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 3:47:02 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Norma Creps	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I respectfully oppose SB2074 as we have, in Hawaii, for many years maintained strong protections against outdoor advertising. As a people we made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow outdoor advertising in our public spaces and landscapes. This bill would break from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. As you know, that change would not remain confined to a single location. It would establish a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. As such, I strongly urge this Legislature to hold SB2074.

Mahalo for your time,

Norma Creps

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 3:58:41 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Nancy Somers Shaw	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose SB2074. Hawaii is already too crowded and over advertised. Protect our unquie State by keeping it free from over commercialization.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/5/2026 10:08:11 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jacqueline Wah	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am **STRONGLY OPPOSED** to **SB 2074**.

Allowing exterior advertising on our public facilities goes against our anti-billboard signage laws.

More commercial advertising with no limits on size, content, or brightness will only lead to more visual pollution that mars our beautiful landscape.

Please **REJECT** SB 2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 5:06:21 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marisa Nguyen	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose.

Don't enter the slippery slope, because we'll end up having:

People putting up billboards on our roadways and fly banners towed by airplanes along Waikiki beach with messages ranging from product advertisements to marriage proposals to campaign slogans to pictures of mutilated fetuses...

Our lack of signage sets us apart.

Let's not risk changing a law that makes us the envy of so many other places.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 5:09:45 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
bob ress	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Hawaii is the envy of mainland towns who mar their landscapes with billboards and banners, fly-by and drive-by advertisements.

Let's not open Pandora's box to this. Nip it in the bud.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 5:13:27 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Thinh Nguyen	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This will lead to billboards and signage we've fought hard to prevent. Let's not allow it. Stay strong.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 6:58:44 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Rachel K Johnson	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose billboards in Hawaii. No billboards!

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 11:54:29 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Susan Trombley	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair, Vice Chair and members,

My name is Susan Trombley. I respectfully oppose SB 2074.

Hawai‘i’s longstanding prohibition on outdoor advertising has helped preserve the natural beauty and cultural identity of the islands for nearly a century.

SB 2074 would represent a significant departure from this legacy by authorizing commercial outdoor advertising on the exterior of buildings. Even if limited, this change would set a precedent that could lead to further commercialization of public spaces.

I urge you to reject SB 2074 and protect Hawai‘i’s scenic character.

Mahalo for your opposition to SB 2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 12:31:16 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Martha Cannon	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

We who live in Aina Hina strongly oppose any billboards or other signs of any kind with the possible exception of political signs that we can't avoid.

It is shocking that the legislature would allow this travesty to even be considered. I strongly oppose SB2074

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 3:01:11 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
susan chouljian	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully oppose SB2074 - the proposal to allow public billboards in Hawai'i, as they would detract from the islands' natural beauty and community character. Hawai'i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments.

Susan Chouljian

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/6/2026 10:40:59 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Zachary Mermel	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has consistently opted, across many decades to not permit its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is part of our identity and economy. I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074.

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/7/2026 9:54:41 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jack O'Neill	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

My name is Jack O'Neill, and I strongly oppose SB2074 SD1 HD2.

In Hawaiian culture, names carry meaning and history. They honor ancestors, reflect identity, and connect us to the land. Leasing the naming rights of our stadium to a private entity in exchange for advertising disrespects this cultural significance and diminishes the public character of this space. These facilities are public venues built and maintained with taxpayer dollars. They are not private assets meant to be marketed to the highest bidder.

SB2074 SD1 HD2 also expands commercial advertising by allowing outdoor advertising on the exterior of the stadium. These changes weaken long-standing limits that help preserve the character of our communities. We are proud and responsible to protect our scenic beauty; this bill moves us in the wrong direction.

Last year, similar legislation faced overwhelming public opposition. That message has not changed. The people do not want corporate branding imposed on our shared public spaces.

Mahalo,
Jack O'Neill

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/7/2026 11:49:00 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jessica Wise	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I respectfully oppose SB2074. Hawai‘i has made a deliberate, century-long decision not to allow its public spaces and landscapes to become commercial advertising environments. This bill breaks from that approach by allowing large, highly visible exterior advertising on a public facility, without statutory limits on content, size, brightness, movement, or visibility. That change will not remain confined to a single location. It establishes a precedent that will extend to other public assets and will be difficult to reverse once implemented. Hawai‘i’s visual environment is part of our identity and economy. I urge the Legislature to hold SB2074. PLEASE KEEP HAWAII BEAUTIFUL! Aloha!

SB-2074-HD-2

Submitted on: 4/7/2026 12:01:51 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/7/2026 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lila Gardner	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Think about it ; we do not need more distractions via advertising--digital or signs as we go to enjoy events anywhere. Please do not allow this bill to pass.

thank you, Lila Gardner