PUBLIC TESTIMONY
Aloha Chair Mugiishi and Commissioners,

Thank you for voting to adopt the new data for the military extraction numbers. It gave the technical group an ideal opportunity to revisit the State House district maps for O'ahu and the Big Island to address the valid concerns of community advocates and Neighborhood Board Chairs.

It appears that the most recent set of revised maps that the technical group will officially present at the January 13th meeting is a vast improvement. As a sixth generation Mānoa resident, I am especially pleased to see that the geographic borders of Mānoa valley are being maintained to keep us as one, compact State House District. Also, I was happy to see that the concerns of the community members in Kailua, Waimānalo, and Hawai'i Kai were finally addressed, as District 51 will not be wrapping around Makapu'u. However, in the process of making the adjustments, I hope that the technical group will be mindful not to dilute the vote of other strong Native Hawaiian communities like Papakōlea.

I greatly appreciate your consideration, time, and effort in serving our state in this capacity. Please strive to do what is pono by closely adhering to Article IV of our State Constitution. The people of Hawai'i deserve a chance at a true democratic republic.

Mahalo nui loa,
Vanessa Distajo

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Reapportionment Commissioners,

I have just seen the Proposed (Revised) State House Plans on v1231 Hawaii Population Base adopted January 6, 2022 (as redrawn by the Technical Committee Permitted Interaction Group) that is to be presented at the January 13, 2022, Hawaii Reapportionment Commission meeting. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you, the Commisioners, for listening to our voices in keeping many of our State House Districts intact. I will now be able to rest with ease knowing that the culture and people of Manoa will remain unified as a single House District. Thank you again for all of your hard work and consideration.

Mahalo,
June Rae Hee :)
(Life-long Manoa resident)

Sent from my Galaxy
I request you reconsider where you have put the community of Waikii. Please include Waikii in House District 7. Community is small and remote like Puuhanahulu. Also, this will address the -700 in House 7 and +102 in House 8.

Mahalo for your consideration.

Cindy Evans
808-345-5810
Aloha Hawaii Redistricting Committee members

My name is Ralph Boyea


We believe that our Community Plan is a significant improvement over the current draft plan proposed by the Hawaii Redistricting Committee’s technical committee. We urge you to consider and adopt our plan for the reasons stated below.

1. Our plan places two House Districts into each of the four Senate Districts. The HRC plan does not follow HRC proposed Senate District lines.

   After working on several drafts of this plan we decided to create a plan based on the HRC’s approved Hawai‘i Senate District map. Hawai‘i island has four [4] Senate seats and eight [8] House seats. It makes perfect sense to place two [2] House seats into each Senate seat. So our current plan did just that.

   Each of the four Hawai‘i island Senate seats are divided into two House seats. The outer borders of the House seats follow the borders of their respective Senate districts. Senate District 1 contains House districts 1 and 2. Senate District 2 contains House districts 3 and 4. Senate District 3 contains House districts 5 and 6. And, Senate District 4 contains House districts 7 and 8.

2. Our total deviation is lower than that of the HRC plan.

   Given the current target of 24,999 residents per House District, we were able to achieve a total deviation of 3.79% as opposed to the HRC plan’s total deviation of 4.74%.

3. Our plan more closely meets the criteria set by Article IV, Section 6 for apportionment.

   In the Community Plan, all eight criteria have been met. In the very least the HRC plan does not meet criteria 4, 6 and 8.
Article IV, Section 6

#4 “Insofar as practicable, districts shall be compact”

The HRC plan has House District 5 spreading from Captain Cook to Keaau. Clearly it is “practicable” to make the district more “compact”. The Community Plan starts House District 5 along the Senate boundary in Volcano. Approximately 20 miles further south.

#6 “Where practicable, representative districts shall be wholly included within senatorial districts.”

The Community Plan does this. Proving it is “practicable”. The HRC plan does not. The underlining of the word “shall” is my emphasis.

We followed Senate District lines because it make total sense when you have 4 Senate districts and 8 House districts to have 2 House districts in each Senate district.

#8 “Where practicable, submergence of an area in a larger district wherein substantially different socio-economic interests predominate shall be avoided.” [Again, my emphasis on “shall.”]

The HRC plan includes rural areas within urban districts. These rural areas have substantially, and significantly different socio-economic interests.

The Community Plan takes care to avoid submerging areas with substantially different socio-economic interests together into one district.

For example, in the HRC plan, House District 2, has urban Hilo populations merged with the rural populations of Orchidland, Hawaiian Acres and Fern Acres. Clearly these areas have significantly different socio-economic interests. The Community Plan places these significantly different areas into rural House Districts.

Clearly, no plan is perfect. The limitations of following census blocks and insuring “drive through” continuity within each district are particularly challenging. However, the Community Plan more closely meets all of the criteria set for under Article IV, Section 6 of the Hawai’i State Constitution. The proposed HRC plans falls short in that regard.
Given the above we believe our Community Plan best serves the residents of Hawai‘i island. We urge you to seriously consider and adopt our plan for the Hawai‘i House Districts.

Mahalo.

Ralph Boyea
Testimony to the State Reapportionment Commission  
January 11, 2022

Aloha Commissioners,

I am a resident of Pālolo Valley who was born and raised on Oʻahu’s windward side. I attended the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, and have lived in the Mōʻiliʻili, Liliha and Waiʻalae areas for a combined total of more than a decade. I have sat on the Pālolo neighborhood board and currently serve as a district chair within the Democratic Party of Hawaiʻi for House District 20.

Public service matters a great deal to me, which is why I have spent countless hours working to create a redistricting proposal for both the House and Senate districts on the island of Oʻahu, soliciting feedback from community members living in every part of the island and incorporating as much of that manaʻo as I possibly could into the two maps I submitted to this commission Jan. 11, 2022 (titled to the effect of “Caron_Oahu House Map_Post Extraction” and “Caron_Oahu Senate Map_Post Extraction”).

These redistricting proposals are like the blueprints for the foundation of our democracy. The lines this commission decides to adopt will have a major impact on the lives of the people living within these districts. Which is why I was disappointed to see early proposals from this commission that appeared to violate basic tenets of the laws governing this process, and that appeared to use this foundational process to advance the political power of certain lawmakers in leadership positions at the expense of others.

I am pleased to see that the most recent proposal from the commission is a great improvement over those earlier proposals. I know how much work it takes to make these maps, and I know it’s not easy to find good solutions to all the problems that the various criteria present. I thank the commission members for their work to improve the maps throughout the process.

Although, the current proposals no longer contain the most egregious violations—such as the Makapuʻu wrap-around district—I still see many smaller, more granular problems. As just one example, the community of Papakōlea appears to be split in half by the current commission proposal. While I recognize that it is sometimes necessary to split very large communities up, this is not one of those cases.

There is a certain flexibility needed to make sure communities aren’t split up like this for no good reason, but that flexibility is hindered when ulterior motives—like making sure some legislators stay within or stay without certain district lines—are not only considered, but given absolute priority. This is why my maps give absolutely no consideration to where any legislators live. They are drawn using only sensible barriers and dividing lines along landmarks and major roads that make sense to the people living there with the goal of preserving the cohesiveness of the communities.
The splitting of Papakōlea is also a good example of another common problem with the commission map, which is that it often reduces the level of both racial and socioeconomic equity within our democratic system. Papakōlea is a Hawaiian homestead community, and it too often is the case that, when a community is going to be carved up to fill out other districts, the community that is chosen is either predominantly Native Hawaiian, economically disadvantaged, or both. To increase equity within our democratic system instead, we should be intentional and deliberate about not doing this.

A similar thing appears to happen to the working-class community of Mōʻiliʻili, which the commission proposal carves up and distributes to wealthier neighboring districts like Mānoa. In our current political system, where money wins elections, carving up working class neighborhoods directly dilutes the political power of the residents living there to elect a representative from the working class.

My proposed map places Mānoa with the more similarly advantaged residents of upper Makiki and Tantalus, while preserving the Mōʻiliʻili neighborhood in its entirety. This allows a wealthy Tantalus resident to face off against a wealthy Mānoa resident in a fair election to represent residents that would be well represented by either candidate from a socioeconomic interest standpoint. Meanwhile, it allows two working class candidates to face off for a fair shot at representing their working class community.

In another significant difference from the commission proposal, but made for the same reasons, my map places the very wealthy Lanikai community with the Kailua and Maunawili communities, while placing the Waimānalo community with the more working class (compared to Lanikai, anyway) Enchanted Lake community. This also makes more sense geographically since you cannot travel (by land anyway) from Lanikai to Waimānalo without going through Enchanted Lake to begin with.

These are just a few of the examples, but there are many others that impact just about every portion of the island. This is where the weeks I have spent getting feedback from people living in these communities—both before the recent (and correct) decision to extract non-resident military personnel from the count, as well as afterward—pays off.

These kinds of concerns over dilution of political power, over proposed boundaries that make little or no sense to the people actually living there on the ground, underline the importance of this process to the lives of the people residing within the boundaries we superimpose over communities during this process.

This is not a process that should be taken lightly, without deep thinking, or used recklessly for political gain. To do so does a great disservice to the people of Hawaiʻi. I hope this commission will come to that realization and consider adopting the maps I have submitted with community feedback, either in their entirety or in part if the commission feels it can make use of some of the ideas I have about where these boundaries ought to be and why.
I recognize deadlines are tight, but it’s critical we get this right. Myself and other community members have proven that these maps can be created thoughtfully in a matter of days, not weeks. So there is no excuse for not continuing to work to create the best possible maps that we can right up until the final deadline. I would be happy to work with the commission to do this, and I know other community members would be happy to do so as well.

Though I again recognize and thank the commission members for their work, in the future I think this process should be driven from the community on upward from the very beginning, and not as a top-down process that originates from the political powerhouses in the state legislature.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify on this important process.

Respectfully,

Will Caron
Pālolo Valley
Aloha Hawaii Redistricting Committee Members,

I am in full support of the 'H8 Community Plan' as it is more thoughtful and inclusive of communities with similar needs and are not being split apart. Rural is staying in rural and urban remains in urban for the most part. Although it is most difficult to obtain perfection, given the Census mapping rules and wonky census block designs and shapes. A map that best represents its constituents around the island is what I would like to see and support.

Enclosed is an image of the proposed 'H8 Community Plan' map submitted by Ralph Boyea

Mahalo for your time and efforts.

Maki Morinoue

96725
Holualoa

--
Maki Morinoue
Share your ALOHA
"Aloha Spirit" is the coordination of mind and heart within each person. It brings each person to the self. Each person must think and emote good feelings to others. In the contemplation and presence of the life force, "Aloha,"
Aloha mai kakou, My name is Jeannine Johnson and I am the Secretary to the Niu Valley Community Association as well as the Kuli'iou'ou / Kalani Iki Neighborhood Board #2. Both Boards unanimously voted to oppose the proposed reapportionment plan that divides the ahupua’a of Niu in half with the West side in House District 18 and the East side in House District 17 and instead supports the alternate redistricting plans submitted by Bill Hicks for House Districts 17 and 18. Both Boards strongly urge the Reapportionment Commission Technical Group to redraw the proposed boundary configuration for House Districts 17 and 18 to maintain Niu’s natural geographic boundary as well as its historical boundary for the past nearly 200 years. Mahalo, Jeannine
Dear Committee,

I have followed the processes of the "H8 Community Plan"
I support the H8 Community Plan. Their processes and conclusions make their plan more relevant, thoughtful and inclusive of communities. Their boundaries incorporate communities with similar needs. The official plan doesn't do this and actually splits communities apart.
Mahalo,
Tlaloc Tokuda
Kailua Kona, 96740
January 12, 2022

Aloha Chair Mugiishi and Members of the Reapportionment Commission,

My name is Jenn Kagiwada and I am writing in SUPPORT of the H8 Community Plan for redistricting the State House Districts on Hawai‘i Island.

The H8 Community Plan was drafted by Hawai‘i Island residents from the various districts around the island-a true community plan. The group made the sensible choice to locate two State House Districts within the district boundaries of each of the four State Senate Districts, keeping the outer district lines the same as the Senate District lines. Senate District 1 contains House Districts 1 and 2; Senate District 2 contains House Districts 3 and 4; Senate District 3 contains House Districts 5 and 6; and, Senate District 4 contains House Districts 7 and 8.

If the Reapportionment Commission chooses to change the delineations between any two House Districts contained within the Senate District boundaries, in order to improve the current metrics in the H8 Community Plan, this could be an even greater service to the people of Hawai‘i Island and the state as a whole.

Thank you for your service and for allowing me to give input on this important process.

Mahalo,

Jennifer Kagiwada, Hilo
January 12, 2022

2021 Reapportionment Commission (Via Email Only)
c/o Scott Nago, Secretary
802 Lehua Avenue
Pearl City, Hawaiʻi 96782

RE: Testimony for the Hawaiʻi State Reapportionment Commission’s January 13, 2022 Meeting

Dear Hawaiʻi Reapportionment Commission:

Common Cause Hawaiʻi is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, grassroots organization dedicated to upholding the core values of American democracy and ensuring a fair and transparent reapportionment and redistricting process.

Common Cause Hawaiʻi appreciates the time and effort that the Hawaiʻi Reapportionment Commission and staff have invested in the critically important task of shaping Hawaiʻi’s political and social future for the next ten years. We especially applaud the significant changes made to the proposed modified legislative reapportionment plans that take into account public testimonies and concerns, which are in keeping with your responsibilities to the public.

We note, however, this iteration of the legislative reapportionment plans newly divides different communities that hereto have not participated in this process to offer their feedback. Split in two or more pieces, the political voice and influence of communities like Papakōlea (which will be split between House Districts 26 and 27 in the proposed modified legislative reapportionment plans) will be negatively impacted for the next decade. Therefore, Common Cause Hawaiʻi respectfully asks the 2021 Hawaiʻi Reapportionment Commission, in keeping with its duties and authority, to revise the current modified legislative reapportionment plan to keep communities like Papakōlea whole.

Common Cause Hawaiʻi is still disappointed that the Hawaiʻi Reapportionment Commission did not take the opportunity to end prison gerrymandering in Hawaiʻi, when it revised the extraction numbers. Common Cause Hawaiʻi has advocated since the start of the 2021 reapportionment process that incarcerated persons should not be counted in the population count for the district in which their facilities are located, as this alters the representational proportions and the voting power of residents. We have even provided you with information as to how to adjust where incarcerated people are counted for a truly accurate reapportionment and redistricting process in Hawaiʻi. Prison gerrymandering must end. Therefore, Common Cause Hawaiʻi respectfully asks this Commission to include our request for a legislative remedy ensuring incarcerated people are counted according to their communities and not their facilities into its report to the Hawaiʻi State Legislature.
Lastly, Common Cause Hawai‘i encourages this Commission to take into account public testimony when finalizing maps. Given the significant changes and tight deadlines this Commission is facing, the most efficient and effective way to get feedback on how various communities will be impacted is through public testimony.

If you have any questions or concerns, I am available to discuss further at 808-497-4629 or kainoa@kaiwiula.com.

Very respectfully yours,

Kainoa Kaumeheiwa-Rego

Kainoa Kaumeheiwa-Rego
Common Cause Hawai‘i
Dear Commissioners,

First, thank you for going back to the drawing board using the updated data which gives Hawaii County 8 House seats.

I served as the Hawaii County Redistricting Commissioner for District 1. Your map has a lot of overlap with the County map which makes it easier for voters to understand. It also does not have drastic changes which is also helpful.

I support your new map in terms of House 1, with a minor question relating to Hilo. First, the northern boundary with House 8 on your map is the best solution I've seen. Hawi should indeed be kept with Kohala rather than with Hamakua. Instead of going into Waimea (as we had to do for the County map), Waimea gets its own House 8 and goes all the way to Kawaihae, which is something that the Native Hawaiians prefer.

For the southern boundary, it reaches quite far into Hilo, meaning that Hilo is split into 3 different Districts. It might be possible to take a little bit away from H1 and give it to H2. However, I can't speak for folks in Hilo; some might prefer more people in each of the 3 Districts to give them more voice in each.

Also for H3, we heard loud and clear from the Native Hawaiian community that Keaukaha should be with Panaewa since families displaced by the airport moved to Panaewa. That would take away from H2, but the deviations give some room to maneuver.

Bottom line: The people of the rural Hamakua coast in House 1 support this map with any minor changes you might make.

Aloha,

Meizhu Lui, Papaaloa, Hawaii Island
To: Reapportionment Committee
Mark Mugishi, MD, Chair
From: Marilyn B. Lee 808 5424438, 808 623-6707
Subject: Testimony in Opposition to the New Reapportionment Plan for Mililani
Dear Chair and Members of the Reapportionment Committee,
My name is Marilyn Lee and I represented districts 38 and 36 during the last two reapportionments. Waipio Acres was included in both 38 and 36 and I think in the old Mililani district 12.
The new plan outrageously eliminates Waipio Acres and puts it into the Wahiawa District where it has not been for at least the last 20 years. Waipio Acres is a vital and valuable part of Mililani. It’s address is Mililani, 96789. Waipio Acres children attend Mililani schools and are represented by Neighborhood Board 25. Citizens in Waipio Acres do their shopping in Mililani Town and many are employed there. It is a stone’s throw from Waipio Acres to my home on Newe Place in Mililani Town. Many folks walk back and forth to shop and children sometimes walk up Snake Hill to go to school at Kipapa.
Wahiawa people know little about the problems of Waipio Acres and they would be a step child in the Wahiawa district. Some would proudly say that the new plan gives Mililani 2 Districts. This is not true. The new plan gives Mililani three Representatives and disrespectfully ignores the fact that Waipio Acres was here long before most of Mililani Town and all of Mililani Mauka. This is completely unfair and needs to be remedied. I implore you to reconsider this plan. It will be in existence for the next 10 years and may do irreparable damage to the citizens there.
Marilyn B. Lee

Marilyn B. Lee
marilyn@marilynblee.com
January 12, 2022

Hawaii Redistricting Commission

Aloha Commissioners,

As a resident of Hawaii County I appreciate your acceptance of the updated population figures from the Department of Defense and the commensurate creation of an 8th House district on Hawaii Island.

The current issue is the creation of this eighth district to best reflect the composition of our island community taking in the demographic and geographic make up of our citizenry. In looking at the first draft map that was created by the commission I fail to see that these concerns were shared by your committee members. On our large island the most obvious and important distinction is between our urban and rural areas. With all of the emphasis on our state becoming more self sufficient in food production it would seem very important to me for our rural areas, which are truly the breadbasket of the state, to be given adequate representation in the House. I hate to throw out the term gerrymandering but when district lines are created in such a way that urban populations are linked into rural populations this effectively reduces the legislative power of the rural areas. I can use my own residence as an illustration. I live 3 blocks from the downtown post office in Hilo. Your first draft map places me in the large district that includes all of Hamakua. Clearly my concerns are very different from those of this agricultural region.

The map that has been created by a group including Ralph Boyea does a much better job of keeping like minded communities together. I especially appreciate the simplicity of dividing each Senate district into two House districts. Since the Senate districts have already been created and approved this is an easy way to keep our district numbers balanced. This map places me in a Hilo centric district which best represents my concerns and various positions. And it creates a Hamakua district that is truly rural in nature.

Thank you for your consideration and good luck with your deliberations.

Mahalo,
Phil Barnes
64 Amauulu Road
Hilo, HI 96720
greenhi3@yahoo.com
January 12, 2022

Aloha Commissioners,

I am grateful for the opportunity to submit testimony at today’s hearing. I am testifying in opposition to the proposed House District map due to possible negative social and economic impacts on our Native Hawaiian community. The proposed House limits the capacity of those living in the Hawai‘ian Home Lands of Papakōlea, Kewalo, and Kalāwahine from expressing their concerns and political preferences together. I am a resident of Kalāwahine.

Our communities are currently marginalized and the proposed division will continue to worsen this. The continued division of Hawai‘ian Home Lands is very concerning. The possible continuation of this proposed map over the next 10 years may perpetuate divisiveness within our homestead and on home lands. I recognize that this placement of the boundary line may have been made in error while the Reapportionment Commission was working to resolve the concerns of other communities. I believe strongly that all of the contiguous homestead lands in this area should be maintained in one House District, as previous drafts included.

I call upon the Reapportionment Commission to recognize our community’s concerns and revise this portion of the map. My personal preference is that our community is added to the proposed House District 26. Whichever House District the Commission ultimately adds us to, it is crucial that we are kept together.

Mahalo for your considerations,

[Signature]

Kāhealani Keahi
President
Hui Maka‘āinana a Kalāwahine
From: Mary Smart  
Mililani Town resident  
For: January 13, 2022 Meeting – Plan to Testify at the Meeting

The Technical Committee’s new redistricting maps are better for Mililani Town than previous ones but now negatively impact Mililani Mauka and they don’t keep Mililani Town as compact as possible. This large change for Mililani Mauka at such a late date may not give those residents sufficient time to respond.

There is no rationale for splitting Mililani Mauka above the H2 if you adhere to the published redistricting guidelines. If you keep all of Mililani Mauka together in one district (now 38), then more of Mililani Town could be intact in District 37 and it wouldn’t be necessary to go as far south into Waipahu to form a properly sized house district. Since Waipahu isn’t managed under Mililani Town Association covenants, it makes sense to minimize the inclusion of Waipahu Gentry in the Mililani Town electoral district. This would give the Representative for Waipio Gentry/Waikele the ability to focus on issues more relevant to his/her geographic area.

There have been public submissions that show it is possible to keep most communities in the same district. There was one set of maps that seemed to have island-wide approval as a baseline. It doesn’t appear that those maps were considered in forming the Technical Committee’s maps in spite of the overall support.

This 2022 reapportionment offers an opportunity of fixing any/all mistakes that may have occurred in the past. The Commissioners are directed to establish district boundaries that make sense regarding community cohesion and geographic contiguity, regardless of incumbent/future candidate home residences.
When designing Hawaii Island House districts we appeal to you to keep Waikoloa Beach Resort in the same district as Waikoloa Village and Waimea. This is where our common interests and community lie. Cutting the resort off from its community of Waikoloa and Waimea would deprive the residents of opportunities for meaningful political representation and engagement.

Thomas Delaney
Kathleen Delaney
69-1010 Keana Place
Waikoloa, HI 96738
Sent from my iPhone
Aloha Commissioners,

Thank you for your work on the commission and for considering new maps to reflect the updated extraction data.

I strongly support the H8 Community Plan.

I personally know some of the people who developed this plan. These people do their homework, know the community and local politics intimately, and care deeply about our island.

H8 meets all eight criteria in the law. The Commission plan does not.

H8 includes all House districts wholly within Senate districts. Compared to the Commission plan, H8 has lower total deviation; keeps districts more compact; and does better at separating rural and urban areas.

Please support H8. Times are hard enough without people having to go to court to ensure their voices will be heard in the State Legislature.

Mahalo, Cory Harden, Hilo
To: Chair Mark Mugiishi, M.D.  
State Reapportionment Commissioners  
State Reapportionment Commission, Staff  
reapportionment@hawaii.gov

From: Bronsten Kossow  
P.O. Box 2993  
Kailua-Kona, HI 96745  
Brons10kalei@gmail.com

12 January 2022

RE: Submitting testimony to the 2021 State Reapportionment Commission.

Aloha Chair Mugiishi and Commissioners of the State Reapportionment Commission,

My name is Bronsten Kossow, former chairman of the 2021 Hawaiʻi County Redistricting Commission, a Kona resident, and testifying as an individual. First, I’d like to thank and commend the State Commission for their service and work to the State. I appreciate the hard work you folks are doing to create and establish political boundaries across Hawaiʻi, and I recognize the difficulty in allocating proper adjustments and deviations to best serve the communities without disrupting representation for the people of Hawaiʻi.

As of the commissions January 6, 2022 meeting and allowing an eighth State House seat on Hawaiʻi Island after the readjustment of the data; I had created an alternative map that I feel best represents Hawaiʻi Islands socio-economic, political, geographical, connectivity in roads, transportation, harbors, schools, water, and conservation. After the last few months of meeting with the community and listening into public discussion, dialog, and forums the following is what I had created to reflect those thoughts.

House District 1 (Hāwī, Waimea, Honokaʻa, Honomū)  
- North Kohala is paired with portions of Waimea and extends to the Honomū area. The district runs along the Kohala Mountain Rd. that follows into Waimea town and follows the Māmalahoa Hwy and ends at Puʻukapu Hawaiian Homelands.  
- To gain numbers proved difficult, if you placed District 1 into similar lines as of the 2011 or 2021 State Commission maps, the district would either further into Kohala or into Hilo to settle the deviations. As Kohala and Hāmākua remain a rural district, splitting Hilo’s urban core is not the best obstacle for representation.  
- District 1 should continue as a rural district. Portions of the leeward coastline geographically are different than that of Hāmākua. The commission will take on a difficult task of splitting portions of Hilo, Puna, and Kaʻu if this district isn’t placed properly.  
- Splitting Waimea will make for a tough decision, however, the growing populous in Waimea town is something to consider.
- In previous testimony to the 2021 State Reapportionment Commission, members of the public testified not to split Native Hawaiian Homelands. In the case for my proposal, I have kept Pu‘ukapu into one district.
- To note: Kohala High School and Honoka‘a High School are still congruent to this map.

House District 2 (Honomū, Pepe'ekeo, Pāpa‘ikou, Hilo)
- I recognize the importance of including a bit of outside Hilo, even back toward Honoli‘i as many of our community members supported that move in the council redistricting.
- If Honomū proves to be too far, perhaps Pāpa‘ikou could be the boundary, this would place portions of Waimea back into District 8.
- Typically placing Wainaku or Wailuku rivers as the boundary has been a great marker, currently there are some census block irregulates within this area.
- Bayfront and downtown Hilo is included into District 2.
- In this iteration, I included Mauna Kea into district 2, because of the connectivity to the mountain.

House District 3 (Portions of Hilo, Keaukaha, Panaewa, and Kea‘au)
- As many have testified in the Hawaii County Redistricting, the importance here is preserving the representation for Keaukaha and Pana‘ewa areas. I combined these 2 locations, which also includes Keaukaha Military Reserve, Hawaiian Homelands, and the Hilo Airport. Steinbeck highway is the boundary for this district.
- I included Pōhakuloa into this district because the testimony in the Hawai‘i County Redistricting Commission supported the Pōhakuloa’s command post be in the same district.

House District 4 (Lower Puna) & House District 5 (Upper Puna)
- It is important to keep Upper Puna in Upper Puna and Lower Puna in Lower Puna.
- In House District 4, I included HPP and follows Highway 180, the makai portions remain in District 4 while Pahoa, Kalapana, and Wao Kele O Puna is included in this district.
- The communities in these areas have always seen representation shift toward Hilo or to Ka‘u.
- The Puna people deserve these representations, not including Hilo or the Ka‘u populous.

House District 6 (Pāhala, Na‘alehu, Ocean View, Miloli‘i, Hoʻokena, Honaunau, Captain Cook, Keauhou, portions of Kailua-Kona)
- Ka‘u and south Kona have similar and unique characteristics that remain in the rural district.
- We’ve heard testimony about keeping South Kona and Ka‘u together versus previous iterations showed South Kona, Ka‘u, and Puna.
- This keeps all Ka‘u together, which has been proven difficult in previous attempts.

House District 7 (Kona Proper)
- Include all of Kona proper together to Hina Lani St. This will allow a central representative in Kona as in Hilo.
- I placed district 7 into the city as the city continues to grow and the district remains centralized.

House District 8 (North Kona, Waikoloa, Waimea)
- I placed District 8 into a central north district as palisades, Waikoloa, and the resorts are common, and the expectation of growth in the district.
- There could be more of a discussion about how to best serve these communities, as this district does not have a specific town or city. Most of North Kona residents are Kailua-Kona residents, and most of Waikoloa residents view themselves Kona or Waimea residents.

I personally feel the map I’ve created, Mr. Ralph Boyea, and Mr. James Hustace best represent our island unit. Please consider these maps in your deliberations.

Mahalo for the opportunity to submit testimony,

Bronsten Kossow
To: Dr. Mark Mugiishi, Chair  
Members of the 2021 State of Hawaii Reapportionment Commission

Date: January 13, 2022

Aloha, my name is Trish La Chica and I am a resident of Mililani Town, where I am raising my little family. I am a community leader, advocate, Chair of District 36, Democratic Party of Hawaii, and the Secretary of Neighborhood Board #25 representing Mililani Town, Waipio Acres and Melemanu. While I serve in these various capacities, I am submitting my testimony as an individual.

I am in support of the proposed final district maps adopted on 1/6/22 for Mililani as it finally attempts to unify both Mililani Town and Mauka.

Mililani is one of two master planned communities on Oahu and we are a single community sharing the same resources, schools, and shopping centers. Mililani is in a beautiful Central Oahu district where neighbors know one another, children play and grow up together, and residents stay year-round, extending to successive generations. These are the reasons people choose to live in Mililani.

While not ideal, I am grateful to the commission for choosing to listen to community and redrawing the lines to avoid dividing the district into multiple districts that stretched all the way from Kunia to Kaena Point. In my observations, the new maps would:

1. Overall: Result in a significant shift in the new district lines result by decreasing the current house districts from three to two. District 45, which currently stretches from Mililani Town to Waialua and Mokuleia now belongs to the Wahiawa district. The Senate lines also shift with the district from Wahiawa and Mauka now getting portions of upper Mililani.

2. Mililani Town will now have two House Representatives and two Senators. District 38 (currently District 36) will include Mililani Mauka except for the portion south of Mililani Ravine Park, and upper Mililani Town north of Meheula Pkwy and the northwest portion of Kam Hwy will include the area above district park up to the golf course. District 37 will expand to include the area by the Mauka ravine park up to Aina makua drive and lower Mililani Town.

3. Waipio Acres and Launani Valley/Tech Park will now be under one house rep vs the current two and will be in the Wahiawa House district.

My only requested amendment is to consider including Waipio Acres, which is the oldest area of Mililani with the Mililani Town district (not Wahiawa) as families in Waipio Acres attend Kipapa Elementary and Mililani HS.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Trish La Chica
My name is Kristine Kubat. I am a registered voter living in the Hilo Senate District 1 and House District 3. I support this plan because it creates new boundaries for the house districts in an apolitical way.

It also creates order and will make it easier for house and senate members to collaborate. This is something we should be encouraging.

Thank you.

Please vote for the H8 community plan.
Aloha,

As a Hawaii Island resident I am in opposition to the House plan put forward by the HRC and in strong support of H8 Community Plan as submitted by Ralph Boyea.

Na'u me ke mahalo,
na Briana
Kurtistown, HI 96760
Aloha Commissioners,

I am writing to you to please support the H8 Community Plan as submitted by Ralph Boyea. Like many in my community, I am concerned about fair process and representation for myself and my neighbors because we reside in part of an area on the Big Island that is large enough to fit all of O‘ahu and Maui islands into, but has had no representatives living in this giant area for the last decade or longer.

We are a prime example of taxation without representation. We have the lowest income, and yet pay a larger share of regressive taxes and have the least amount of access to emergency services, healthcare services, and basic infrastructure, including roads, water, electric, and internet connectivity. It’s a travesty!

Of further concern, this entire process, from the start of the under-counting in the Census to the rushed re-mapping that is occurring now, is diluting our input and minimizing our voices. This process has been confusing, redundant, exhaustive, and not at all transparent.

It is laudable for the Commissioners and Staff to work through these unprecedented times and on an extreme deadline, due to COVID; however, it will be an egregious disservice to my community if you push through the final maps without proper time for public input.

You are tasked to do the right thing for the people of this area as much as Kona, so it is crucial to allow for as much input as we have provided for with maps that were created based on the original extraction process. Hearings need to be conducted specifically in the areas that changes are occurring due to updated extraction numbers, which are areas primarily in Hawai‘i Island and O‘ahu.

The people need to have adequate notice of these meetings, they need to be publicly advertised, and we deserve to have the ability to view the public submissions of maps and the Technical Committee’s maps on equal footing. This means we should be able to see them in a side-by-side comparison, or independently with the ability to easily scroll into detailed areas of concern, not just an overlay that appears to give preference to the Tech Committee’s proposal.

Upon review of all the maps submitted for Hawai‘i Island, there appear to be 3 great alternatives to the submission made by the Tech Committee. There are problems with the Tech Committee’s map so I am in strong opposition to the Tech Committee’s proposal for the following reasons including that the division of districts is horrendous.

A frequent criticism by the Commissioners of public maps that were submitted earlier in this process was that some districts were being made “unnecessarily” large. While we all realize large districts are unavoidable in some parts of our island due to low population, the Southern Kona/Ka‘u district was drawn into this map in the LARGEST possible way ever in any prior submissions. This is unacceptable due to the issues in lack of representation.

It’s folly to expect Kea‘au to be connected to Captain Cook, these communities have completely different needs and it would be impossible for a representative to attempt to bridge that gap in services regularly. Point of fact, google maps actually suggests that driving outside of the district
and going across Saddle road would cut off about 10 minutes of the over 2 hour travel time and is a better solution to connect these two parts of the island that are almost as far away from each other as is possible to get without driving into lower Puna.

A similar (although not quite as drastic) problem occurs in connecting the surrounding Hilo communities to Honoka'a. The upper Puna subdivisions are now also divided across multiple districts and connected to Keaukaha. Both Hilo and Kona towns are divided in odd ways. The question becomes who is benefited by this plan and why are you pushing through the least helpful to the people you're supposed to be representing?

There are similar concerns about Hustace v1 and v3; however, the Hustace v2 map could be a viable solution to many of the problems outlined above. It is a 9.22% deviation but that could be slightly reduced by H5 going north into H6 a bit and the boundary between H1 and H2 could shift north also to help balance out those numbers.

The Kossow map is probably the most acceptable by moving the H2 southern boundary a bit and expanding H3 towards Kea'au. This map at a distance does a pretty fair job of dividing the large landmass areas into much more equal and manageable chunks by reducing the largeness of the South Kona/Ka’u area district and putting the Puna districts back together. It also fixes the issue of Hilo communities and Honoka’a being connected and does a better job of keeping downtown Kona together.

The Boyea community map is a clear winner. Not only did Mr. Boyea attempt to get as much community input and support as he could possibly do in the ridiculously short period of time he had and he invited the Commissioners to participate if they wanted to in his process as well. His deviation is the best, with only 3.79% and he also took into account a provision in the mapping criteria that implies where possible House district lines should follow Senate lines. This map appears to follow the Senate lines and breaks each Hawai‘i Island Senate district into two House districts.

The following issues with his map then are really no fault of his and instead actually lie with the issues that are already embedded in the mostly finalized Senate map. This prompts one to propose that we also reevaluate those lines by making the following adjustments that would correct both of these maps in favor of the needs of our communities.

1. H2 and H3 lines could move slightly east towards Puna to encompass more Hawaiian Homelands area and keep Panaewa area with Keaukaha in H2, not divide that demographic.
2. H3 and H5 lines could shift to put more of Volcano Village together into H3 and not separate that community.
3. The line between H6 and H5 could move north, closer to the line suggested by the Tech Committee to keep a better deviation after making the Volcano switch.
4. Another solution to the deviation/large area in H5 is that we could collectively decide that a larger population gap in H5 is acceptable due to the vastness of the landscape and the fact that this area has been historically underrepresented. By allowing for a bigger population deviation number here, this actually gives the current residents a bigger voice in their government, which I feel would be a small step towards righting a historically monumental wrong that has been done to these populations in the last couple of decades.
5. Beyond the bottom corner of H4 (which is a zero population area) shifting slightly based on which census block was chosen in various maps, all map illustrations kept the H4 area together. I think this is worth noting, as this “lower” Puna population clearly lends itself to being one district and has the population numbers to warrant it. I also think it’s important to draw attention to the fact that while it doesn’t change the overall deviation numbers, it does
change the deviation numbers slightly in the Boyea map to include Pohaku circle and yet they decided to do so anyway due to their commitment to keeping subdivisions/communities connected wherever possible. This is admirable in such an imperfect system, to see such a commitment to strive for inclusion and connection when possible.

In summary, these are a few suggestions to improve upon the publicly submitted maps, primarily, the Kossow and Boyea maps are the two that would be best to focus on moving forward.

Even if none of the above suggestions as are more deeply plumbed by a fellow community member Shannon Matson are incorporated, either of those, or Hustace v2, are a far better representation of what our communities need on Hawai‘i Island.

I STRONGLY urge the Commission to scrap their plan entirely and move forward with one of the public submissions instead so we in the community can all submit further detailed input and make final adjustments before the deadline. Please represent the people and the needs of this island by doing the right thing, not the fastest thing.

Mahalo,

Susan Bambara
Kurtistown
TESTIMONY OF

LARRY S VERAY

TO THE STATE REAPPORPTIONMENT COMMISSION

OPPOSITION TO REVISED FINAL DISTRICT MAPS FOR SENATE DISTRICTS RELATED TO PEARL CITY

January 13, 2022

Aloha, Chair Mugiishi and Reapportionment Commissioners. As Chair for the Pearl City Neighborhood Board No. 21, this is my third testimony to the Commission and our board’s continued STRONG OPPOSITION to the State Reapportionment Commission and Technical Committees latest revised maps for Senate Redistricting for the Pearl City area.

Chair Mugishi, I am directing my comments directly to you as leader and Chair of this Commission. It is your responsibility to make sure the public is heard and their input is fairly considered for the development of the new redistricting map. You heard my previous testimony; did you inform the Technical Committee to review and consider the Pearl City Neighborhood Board inputs?

Why does Pearl City continue to be carved up into four Senate Districts? If the Commission Plan is adopted, do you really think we are going to get the care and feeding from all four Senators equally especially when District 15’s primary focus is the Salt Lake and Pearl Harbor area. Senate District 22’s focus will be Mililani. Where do you think Pearl City will be prioritized with these two districts? We desire solely District 16 and 17 for Pearl City. PLEASE MAKE THIS HAPPEN!

In my opinion only, the following is where your Commission has failed the public:

- Technical Committee is working in a vacuum, stove-piped, zero collaboration with public testifiers who wanted to help the Commission develop a successful Senate District Plan.

- Technical Committee has demonstrated the lack of respect and no direct feedback to the Neighborhood Board Chairs who dedicated much of their personal time to help the Commission succeed in their goals through their testimony and the many hours of research and helping develop a fair redistricting plan. That example is the Hick’s plan which places Pearl City into two districts. WE STRONGLY SUPPORT THE HICK’S PLAN.

- No questions from your Technical Committee to those Board Chairs who know their neighborhood areas and their residents. The Technical Committee revised the districts and failed to integrate the Public’s positive, creative and innovative recommended solutions that would lead the commission to success with a collaborative redistricting plan.

I most strongly request you to accept our Neighborhood Board input to the State Redistricting Plans and not carve up Pearl City into four districts forcing the communities of Central and Leeward Oahu into new political areas that make no sense. Mahalo!

Very respectfully,

Larry S. Veray
January 12, 2022

Reapportionment Commission
c/o Office of Elections
802 Lehua Avenue
Pearl City, Hawaii 96782

Dear Hawai‘i Reapportionment Commission:

I am grateful for the opportunity to submit testimony at today’s hearing. I am testifying in opposition to the proposed House District map due to the possible negative social and economic impacts on our community. The proposed House limits the capacity of us who reside on Hawaiian Home Lands, Papakōlea, Kewalo, and Kalāwahine, from expressing our concerns and political preferences together.

Our communities are currently marginalized, and the proposed division will continue to worsen this. The continued division of Hawaiian Home Lands is very concerning. The possible continuation of this proposed map over the next 10 years may perpetuate divisiveness within our Homestead and on Home Lands. I recognize that this placement of the boundary line may have been made in error while the Reapportionment Commission was working to resolve the concerns of other communities. I believe strongly that all of the contiguous Homestead Lands in this area should be maintained in one House District, as previous drafts included.

I call upon the Reapportionment Commission to recognize our community’s concerns and revise this portion of the map. My personal preference is that our community is added to the proposed House District 26. Whichever House District the Commission ultimately adds us to, it is crucial that we are kept together. Mahalo for your considerations.

Me ke aloha pumehana,

Tamar deFries

Tamar deFries, Lessee
Kalāwahine Hawaiian Home Lands
Dear Hawai‘i Reapportionment Commission:

I am grateful for the opportunity to submit testimony at today’s hearing. I am testifying in opposition to the proposed House District map due to possible negative social and economic impacts on our Native Hawaiian community. The proposed House limits the capacity of those living in the Hawaiian Home Lands of Papakōlea, Kewalo, and Kalāwahine from expressing their concerns and political preferences together.

Our communities are currently marginalized and the proposed division will continue to worsen this. The continued division of Hawaiian Home Lands is very concerning. The possible continuation of this proposed map over the next 10 years may perpetuate divisiveness within our homestead and on home lands. I recognize that this placement of the boundary line may have been made in error while the Reapportionment Commission was working to resolve the concerns of other communities. I believe strongly that all of the contiguous homestead lands in this area should be maintained in one House District, as previous drafts included.

I call upon the Reapportionment Commission to recognize our community’s concerns and revise this portion of the map. My personal preference is that our community is added to the proposed House District 26. Whichever House District the Commission ultimately adds us to, it is crucial that we are kept together.

Mahalo for your considerations,
Kalai & Adeline Poaha
(Residents of Kewalo)
To: Reapportionment Commission Chair and Members

From: Amy Monk

Subject: The newest plan for Senate District 25 not conforming to Hawaii Revised Statutes

Thank you to the Commission for hearing the community testimony, the resolutions from Neighborhood Boards, and the recommendations of the Oahu Advisory Council and recognizing Makapuu Point as the geographic division between House District 17 and 51. For the same reasons, Makapuu Point should divide Senate district 9 and 25.

The inclusion of half of Hawaii Kai marina, Kalama Valley and the Portlock area into proposed Senate District 25 with Waimanalo is not consistent with HRS 25-2. The new Senate district 25 now puts Kaiser High School, Hawaii Kai Post Office, and Koko Head Recreation Center in the Waimanalo district.

Reiterating the reasons why Senate District 25 should not combine Waimanalo and Hawaii Kai areas:

The proposed SD 25 is not compact. These two communities are linked only by means of a long, windy two-lane road which at one point carved into a cliff in order to cross a Koolau ridge. It also passes through the Ka Iwi Coast land trust, a stretch of uninhabited, dry scrub, preservation land.

Second, they fail to follow permanent geographical features. The Koolau ridge and trust lands create a natural barrier between north and south, windward and leeward. Makapuu Lighthouse stands on the end of the ridge line that has traditionally been the geographic and political dividing line between the windward and leeward sides of the Koolaus; it was the old Senate line, and is the Congressional district line which divides CD 1 and CD2.

Third, SD 25 fails to stay wholly within a Congressional district.

Fourth, Portlock, Kalama Valley and the Kuapa Pond marina are part of the Hawaii Kai and East Honolulu socio-economic-political infrastructure, not Waimanalo:

- Portlock, Kalama Valley and marina families send their children to Kamiloiki Elementary and Koko Head Elementary, Niu Valley Middle School, and Kaiser High School in Hawaii Kai. They are part of the Kaiser complex. Waimanalo is in the Kailua complex.
- The Neighborhood Board representatives of the marina, Portlock and Kalama Valley belong to the Hawaii Kai Neighborhood Board.
- Infrastructure of the marina, Kalama Valley and Portlock are integral with Hawaii Kai electrical grids, water, sewer, fire and ambulance service, public transportation, etc.

There are two geological features that naturally divide Oahu, the Waianae mountain range that ends at Kaena Point in the west and the Koolau mountain range which ends at Makapuu Point in the east. I urge the Reapportionment Commission to recognize that the natural division line for Senate Districts 9 and 25 is the Makapuu point.
Dear Hawai‘i Reapportionment Commission:

I am grateful for the opportunity to submit testimony at today’s hearing. I am testifying in opposition to the proposed House District map due to possible negative social and economic impacts on our Native Hawaiian community. The proposed House limits the capacity of those living in the Hawaiian Home Lands of Papakōlea, Kewalo, and Kalawahine from expressing their concerns and political preferences together. Our communities are currently marginalized and the proposed division will continue to worsen this. The continued division of Hawaiian Home Lands is very concerning. The possible continuation of this proposed map over the next 10 years may perpetuate divisiveness within our homestead and on home lands. I recognize that this placement of the boundary line may have been made in error while the Reapportionment Commission was working to resolve the concerns of other communities. I believe strongly that all of the contiguous homestead lands in this area should be maintained in one House District, as previous drafts included.

I call upon the Reapportionment Commission to recognize our community’s concerns and revise this portion of the map. My personal preference is that our community is added to the proposed House District 26. Whichever House District the Commission ultimately adds us to, it is crucial that we are kept together.

Mahalo for your considerations,

Brett Aweau
2014 Kamalalehua Place
Honolulu HI 96813
Back at the table, after so much community input, with almost unanimous support for the Bill Hick map, these people have politically wrangled one more time about which politician will win or not.

Being unopposed is not democratic. Yet we have the House Minority Speaker and the Senate Minority Leader along with Rathbun, with a political grudge twisting the maps to their party's political advantage.

If you cannot sway the people with a real common sense agenda and earn their vote, I guess the only alternative is to gerrymander the hell out of the Districts so you can pick and choose your voters.

Shameful on every level, and not worthy of the people of Hawaii.

Once more, even with new data, Bill Hicks has gone back to the table and altered the maps to keep them concise and relevant to the 5 mandates of reapportionment.

Makapuu and Heina Point still remain the traditional boundary points, and the percentage difference is less than 3%.

No one paid him for this work. No one influenced his work except his listening to the neighborhoods and the people which is more than I can say for our politically corrupt technical committee. I cannot believe in this day and age they think they can get away with this.

We all have seen their dissembling and their dishonesty. It is my hope that the FBI will take notice and add these corrupt few to their list of people to be indicted. Once that can of worms is opened, it will be up to them to squirrel themselves out of an orange suit.

This island of Oahu and the other islands deserve honesty and real representation.

Nothing less is tolerable.

Get back to the five mandates of reapportionment and support the Bill Hicks Map.

Robert E Fox
Manoa.
Aloha Hawai‘i Reapportionment Commission,

I am writing in opposition of the proposed House District Map. The new map will divide the political power of the only Hawaiian Homestead Communities located in town, Papakolea, Kewalo and Kalāwahine. It is essential for our communities to be able to use our power collectively to effect change in the legislature and our voice is much stronger when we are able to do so together.

Our communities are interconnected, with families living in multiple neighborhoods in the area (ie. Papakolea and Kalāwahine). This means we work hard to care for one another. Hawaiian Homestead lessees already face economic, social, and political marginalization as a result of inadequate infrastructure and funding. Only as recently as this week, for example, were we given access to purchase internet services from more providers after being locked into an illegal exclusive contract with Sandwich Isles who had only provided dial up level speeds for many years.

I am urging the Reapportionment Committee to keep the Hawaiian Homestead communities of Papakolea, Kalāwahine, and Kewalo intact in drawing the new district line. Our ability to thrive as Hawaiians in Hawai‘i is dependent upon it.

Mālama pono,

Noel

--

Noel Kaleikalaunuoka‘oia‘i‘o Shaw

619-261-5894
January 12, 2022

Reapportionment Commission
c/o Scott Nago, Secretary
802 Lehua Avenue
Pearl City, Hawaii 96782

Dear Commission Members:

Re: Reapportionment of House and Senate Districts in Kakaʻako

I am testifying in support of the Technical Committee Permitted Interaction Group’s revised reapportionment plan with respect to the proposed boundaries and reduced population deviations in Kakaʻako.

The revised plan keeps the Kaka‘ako together within contiguous legislative districts (proposed Senate District 12 and proposed House District 25), rather than splitting it into two separate districts on either side of Ala Moana Boulevard. This addresses a November 2021 resolution by the Ala Moana-Kaka‘ako Neighborhood Board No. 11 (“the Board”), which had strongly urged the Commission to keep the Mauka and Makai portions of Kaka‘ako together. The revised plan is more consistent with Hawai‘i Revised Statues §25-2 (b), as well as the Legislature’s intent to redevelop Kaka‘ako as a cohesive community.

The Board had also urged the Commission to strongly consider alternative plans that minimize the population deviations. This has also been addressed in the revised plan. Relative to the October 2021 plans, the revised plan reduces the population deviations in proposed Senate District 12 from -1.63% to 0.48%, and from -3.87% to 0.57% in proposed House District 25. Note that the Commission may still be able to further improve on the overall islandwide deviations and keep other communities wholly within contiguous districts, as pursuant to Hawai‘i Revised Statues §25-2.

Thank you very much to the Technical Committee Permitted Interaction Group for incorporating these improvements into the revised reapportionment plan and addressing the Board’s concerns for Kaka‘ako. A copy of the Board’s previous resolution is enclosed, for your reference.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter, please contact our Neighborhood Board Assistant, Mr. Spencer Johnson at Spencer.johnson@honolulu.gov or 768-3721.

Sincerely Yours,

Ryan Tam
Chair, Ala Moana-Kaka‘ako Neighborhood Board No. 11

Enclosure
RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE REAPPORTIONMENT OF HOUSE AND SENATE DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, Hawai‘i state law directs the State of Hawai‘i Reapportionment Commission (“Commission”) to redraw, if needed, district boundaries in response to changes in population identified by the decennial United States Census in order to ensure that citizens are equally represented; and

WHEREAS, a “district” is the geographical area whose residents are represented by one member of the Hawaii State Legislature; and

WHEREAS HRS, section 25-2(b) lists the criteria by which the Commission will be guided in redrawing the boundaries, and among the criteria are these: “(3) In so far as practicable, districts shall be compact” and “(4) Where possible, district lines shall follow permanent and easily recognized features such as streets, streams, and clear geographical features, and when practicable, shall coincide with census tract boundaries” and “(6) Where practicable, submergence of an area in a larger district wherein substantially different socio-economic interests predominate shall be avoided”; and

WHEREAS, the Hawaii State Legislature designated the entirety of Kaka‘ako as the Hawaii Community Development Authority’s first Community Development District in order to recognize the neighborhood’s potential to provide more housing, parks, open space, commercial, and industrial areas; and

WHEREAS, the current Senate redistricting proposal maintains the Makai portion of Kaka‘ako within a district that is contiguous with the Mauka portions of Kakaako, Ala Moana, Waikiki, and portions of McCully; and

WHEREAS, the current House redistricting proposal places the Makai portion of Kaka‘ako into new district representing Downtown, Chinatown, and Kalihi; and

WHEREAS, maintaining the Mauka and Makai portions of Kakaako within a contiguous House District would not affect population deviations, since residential development is not currently allowed in this district; and

WHEREAS, alternative plans, such as the “Hicks Plan,” may also provide better geographical representation while also reducing the population deviation between districts; and now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission is strongly urged to keep Mauka and Makai portions of Kaka‘ako within a contiguous legislative district; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission is also urged to strongly consider alternative plans that minimize the population deviation and keeps neighborhoods together.

ADOPTED by the Ala Moana-Kaka‘ako Neighborhood Board No. 11 at its regular meeting on Tuesday, November 23, 2021, by a vote of 8-0-1.

RYAN TAM
Chair
Aloha Ian,

I just received your email below from a Kalawahine neighbor. Mahalo for keeping us informed. See my attached letter. Feel free to call me at 808-478-7680 with any questions. Mahalo, Ramona

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Ian Ross <ianross.hi@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jan 11, 2022 at 12:07 PM
Subject: Proposed State House District Maps Impact on Papakōlea
To: <kahealanikeahi@gmail.com>, <soor001@hawaii.rr.com>,
<solatoris001@gmail.com>, <kula.papakolea@gmail.com>,
<lionelwright808@gmail.com>, Lilia Kapuniai
<lilia@papakolea.org>
CC: Elena Farden <elena@nhec.org>, Calvin
<ckysay@honoolulu.gov>, William Hicks
<billhicksknb@gmail.com>, Dylan Armstrong
<dylanparmstrong@gmail.com>, Kendrick Farm
<farmk@hawaii.edu>, Sandy Ma <SMa@commoncause.org>,
Kainoa Kaumeheiwa-Rego <kainoa@kaiwiula.com>, Jacob Aki
<jacob@kaiwiula.com>

Aloha,

My name is Ian Ross and I serve as the Makiki/Lower Punchbowl/Tantalus Neighborhood Board Chair. This district aligns with some of the outer edges of Papakōlea. I'm reaching out today because I believe the newest map, which was released last night, may inappropriately cut Papakolea in half for the coming decade.

Every 10 years the new census data is used to redraw the lines for the House and Senate, as well as additional other elections. This decides which elected officials represent which people for that decade. It can have large implications on who is elected, what types of projects or approved or blocked, and the laws that are passed.

Significant energy has been placed into advocating for communities such as Waimānalo, Kailua, Hawaii Kai, Makiki, Mānoa, and others to remain intact. The concern was that when communities are split
into two or more pieces, they can become marginalized. The current map for the island is, for the most part, a significant improvement. But please look below and let me know if you believe placing residents of Papakōlea into two these two separate districts will limit how much voters and residents will have their views represented.


I believe that previous versions kept these Hawaiian Homeland more contiguous. In the rush to draft these latest maps, I believe the Commissioners did not fully consider the implications for this portion of our community. While I cannot speak for them or read their minds, I do suspect that this latest draft made this particular change unintentionally.

**There is still time to weigh in and make a difference.** I am at your disposal. As a legislative aide, former public policy and advocacy manager, and present Neighborhood Board Chair, I will do everything I can to help in the short window of time if asked. I can draft model testimony to work from, (employer permitting) attend the hearing to speak to the issue, and email community members to invite them to do the same. I do not want to speak for your community, but I am available to amplify your voice. Testimony from residents will likely be critical to allow for any chance of a change like this. To this end, please let me know who else I should be sharing this email with.

Testimony may be submitted to: reapportionment@hawaii.gov or you may attend the 1 p.m. hearing on January 13th at 1pm. If you attend and would like to provide verbal testimony, just use the "raise hand" feature and wait to be called upon.

I believe the most efficient pathway forward is to have House District 26 and 27 trade parts of each district. Papakōlea may then be placed entirely in one of the two districts, with some portion of Punchbowl likely being moved into the other. I'm not sure if you have a preference for which one. Notably, I believe the proposed House District 27 is an open seat and your community could take part in deciding who wins. Alternatively, the proposed House 26 is presently represented by a powerful figure, Majority Leader Belatti. Also, you do not have to make that decision on which is preferable, and you may just ask to be kept together regardless of where that lands you.

I have CC'd several Neighborhood Board
January 13, 2022

Reapportionment Commission  
c/o Office of Elections  
802 Lehua Avenue  
Pearl City, Hawaii 96782

Dear Hawaiʻi Reapportionment Commission:

I am testifying in opposition to the proposed House District map due to the possible negative social and economic impacts on our community. The proposed House limits the capacity of us who reside on Hawaiian Home Lands, Papakōlea, Kewalo, and Kalāwahine, from expressing our concerns and political preferences as one, together.

Our communities are currently marginalized, and the proposed division will continue to worsen this. The continued division of Hawaiian Home Lands is very concerning. The possible continuation of this proposed map over the next 10 years may perpetuate divisiveness within our Homestead and on Home Lands. I recognize that this placement of the boundary line may have been made in error while the Reapportionment Commission was working to resolve the concerns of other communities. I feel strongly that all the contiguous Homestead Lands in this geographic area be maintained in one House District.

I call upon the Reapportionment Commission to recognize our community’s concerns and revise this portion of the map. My recommendation is that our community (Papakōlea, Kewalo, and Kalāwahine) be included together in House District 26. This request/recommendation is crucial that we be kept together. Mahalo for your consideration.

Aloha,

Ramona Clemente

Ramona Clemente  
Kalāwahine  
Hawaiian Home Lands
Aloha Commissioners,

Please support the H8 Community Plan as submitted by Ralph Boyea. It makes the most sense and was, to my knowledge, created with community input and support. Support echoing the voice of the public.

I’m very concerned about the proposal by the Tech Committee that I understand, connects Honoka’a with Kaumana and other communities bordering Hilo; these communities have little in common and careful inspection would reveal differing needs for the peoples of these radically differing regions of Hawaii. I know being a Hamakua resident for the past 16 years (also formerly living in Kona and South Kona in the early 90’s), that my community has little in common with the communities bordering Hilo town. Respectfully I submit that the people of Hamakua would be challenged to find proper representation under the Technical Committee mapping given population numbers and needs assessments.

This proposal I believe is a bad fit regarding the needs of the community, and we all need input into this important plan. We need more public hearings and better information.

Let me thank you in advance for doing the right thing for the people,
Julie Stowell
Aloha Reapportionment Commission

Auwe! As a member of Neighborhood Board #2 representing Niu, a lineal descendant of Alexander Adams to whom Kamehameha I awarded the entire ahupua'a of Niu (one of approximately 40 currently living here,) and most importantly a long time resident I, urge you in the strongest terms to abandon the current plan to tear this community in two. If successful, this wholly undemocratic rupture will significantly impact our ability to be represented. Instead of one legislative office we will have to multiply any and all efforts by two. With half the number of constituents impacted in each, our voice will be cut in half. (is that the point?)

Attached is a plan drawn up by Will Caron which has thoughtfully preserved the integrity both ancient and modern of this community.

Please redraw the lines so that all of Niu remains in HD18.

me ka ha'a ha'a,
Kauia

C. Kaui Lucas
lucas@kaulana.net
808.282.2007
Aloha Commissioners,

For the record, my name is Shannon Matson and I was born and raised on Hawai‘i island. At various times I have lived in 7 of the now 8 House Districts and am familiar with our entire island. I have been closely following this redistricting process since the beginning of the 2020 Census. I am particularly concerned about fair process and representation for myself and my neighbors as we currently reside in part of an area on the Big Island that is large enough to fit the entirety of O‘ahu and Maui islands into and yet has had no representatives living in this giant area for the last decade or longer. We are a prime example of taxation without representation. We have the lowest income, and yet pay a larger share of regressive taxes and have the least amount of access to emergency services, healthcare services, and basic infrastructure, including roads, water, electric, and internet connectivity.

I am concerned that this entire process, from the start of the undercounting in the Census to the rushed re-mapping that is occurring now, is diluting our input and minimizing our voices. This process has been confusing, redundant, exhaustive, and not at all transparent.

While I appreciate the efforts of the Commissioners and Staff working through unprecedented times and on an extreme deadline, due to COVID, and a host of other obstacles, I do not want to see the final maps pushed through without proper time for public input. It is crucial that we allow for as much input as we have provided for with maps that were created based on the original extraction process. Hearings need to be conducted specifically in the areas that changes are occurring due to updated extraction numbers, my understanding is those areas are primarily Hawai‘i Island and O‘ahu. We need to have adequate notice of these meetings, they need to be publicly advertised, and we deserve to have the ability to view the public submissions of maps and the Technical Committee’s maps on equal footing. This means we should be able to see them in a side-by-side comparison, or independently with the ability to easily scroll into detailed areas of concern, not just an overlay that appears to give preference to the Tech Committee’s proposal.

I have conducted a review of all the maps submitted for Hawai‘i Island and I believe there are 3 great alternatives to the submission made by the Tech Committee. I will discuss them after I illustrate the problems with the Tech Committee’s map.

I am in strong opposition to the Tech Committee’s proposal for the following reasons: while I appreciate that the deviation is below 5%, the division of districts is horrendous. A frequent criticism by the Commissioners of public maps that were submitted earlier in this process was that some districts were being made “unnecessarily” large. While we all realize large districts are unavoidable in some parts of our island due to low population, the Southern Kona/Ka‘u district was drawn into this map in the LARGEST possible way I have ever seen it in any prior submissions. This is unacceptable due to the issues in lack of representation I have outlined above. Kea‘au cannot possibly be connected to Captain Cook, these communities have completely different needs and it would be impossible for a representative to attempt to bridge that gap in services regularly. In fact, google maps actually suggests that driving outside of the district and going across Saddle road would cut off about 10 minutes of the over 2 hour travel time and is a better solution to connect these two parts of the island that are almost as far away from each other as is possible to get without driving into lower Puna. A similar (although not quite as drastic) problem occurs in connecting the surrounding Hilo communities to Honoka’a. The upper Puna
subdivisions are now also divided across multiple districts and connected to Keaukaha. Both Hilo and Kona towns are divided in odd ways. I struggle to see who, if anyone, is benefited by this plan.

I have similar concerns about Hustace v1 and v3. However, the Hustace v2 map I think is a viable solution to many of the problems I outlined above. It is a 9.22% deviation but that could be slightly reduced by H5 going north into H6 a bit and the boundary between H1 and H2 could shift north also to help balance out those numbers.

The Kossow map is probably the most acceptable with a 7.91% that could also potentially be reduced or improved by moving the H2 southern boundary a bit and expanding H3 towards Kea’au. I like this map because at a distance it does a pretty fair job of dividing the large landmass areas into much more equal and manageable chunks. It reduces the largeness of the South Kona/Ka’u area district and puts the Puna districts back together. It also fixes the issue of Hilo communities and Honoka’a being connected and does a better job of keeping downtown Kona together.

The Boyea community map is a clear winner. Not only did Boyea attempt to get as much community input and support as he could possibly do in such a short period of time, but I believe he invited the Commissioners to participate if they wanted to in his process as well. His deviation is the best, with only 3.79% and he also took into account a provision in the mapping criteria that implies where possible House district lines should follow Senate lines. My understanding is this map follows the Senate lines and breaks each Hawai’i Island Senate district into two House districts. The following issues I have with his map then are really no fault of his own and rather lie with the issues that are already imbedded in the mostly finalized Senate map. This prompts me to suggest that we also reevaluate those lines by making the following adjustments that would correct both of these maps in favor of the needs of our communities.

1. H2 and H3 lines could move slightly east towards Puna to encompass more Hawaiian Homelands area and keep Panaewa area with Keaukaha in H2, not divide that demographic.
2. H3 and H5 lines could shift to put more of Volcano Village together into H3 and not separate that community.
3. The line between H6 and H5 could move north, closer to the line suggested by the Tech Committee to keep a better deviation after making the Volcano switch.
4. Another solution to the deviation/large area in H5 is that we could collectively decide that a larger population gap in H5 is acceptable due to the vastness of the landscape and the fact that this area has been historically underrepresented. By allowing for a bigger population deviation number here, this actually gives the current residents a bigger voice in their government, which I feel would be a small step towards righting a historically monumental wrong that has been done to these populations in the last couple of decades.
5. Beyond the bottom corner of H4 (which is a zero population area) shifting slightly based on which census block was chosen in various maps, all map illustrations kept the H4 area together. I think this is worth noting, as this “lower” Puna population clearly lends itself to being one district and has the population numbers to warrant it. I also think it’s important to draw attention to the fact that while it doesn’t change the overall deviation numbers, it does change the deviation numbers slightly in the Boyea map to include Pohaku circle and yet they decided to do so anyway due to their commitment to keeping subdivisions/communities connected wherever possible. This is admirable in such an imperfect system, to see such a commitment to strive for inclusion and connection when possible.
In summary, I have shared a few suggestions to improve upon the publicly submitted maps, primarily Kossow and Boyea are the two I would suggest focusing on moving forward. Even if none of my suggestions are incorporated I strongly believe that either of those, or Hustace v2, are a far better representation of what our communities need and want on Hawai‘i Island. I urge the Commission to scrap their plan entirely and move forward with one of the public submissions instead so we can all submit further detailed input and make final adjustments before the deadline.

Mahalo,
Brent Magstadt, Puna, Hawai‘i
January 12, 2022

State of Hawai‘i Reapportionment Commission

reapportionment@hawaii.gov

RE: January 13, 2022 Meeting
Agenda Item V. Presentation of Modified Proposed Final Legislative and Congressional Reapportionment Plans by the Technical Committee
Permitted Interaction Group

Aloha e ka Luna Ho‘omalu Mark Mugiishi, M.D.,

In our December 15, 2021 Kahalu‘u Neighborhood Board #29 (KNB #29) special meeting, KNB #29 reviewed and discussed the House and Senate redistricting plan proposed by the Commission and also alternative redistricting plans that have been proposed. Our board was very honored to have both Chair Bill Hicks of the Kailua Neighborhood Board #31 and Chair Kimeona Kane of the Waimānalo Neighborhood Board #32 join us to share their insights and understandings of the process and proposals.

Following the review and discussion of the House and Senate redistricting plans proposed, the KNB #29 unanimously passed the following motion:

The Kahalu‘u Neighborhood Board #29 is opposed to the Reapportionment Commission’s proposed plan and SUPPORTS the approach of the Hicks plans for the House and the Senate that includes key concepts that uses Makapu‘u Point as a boundary, minimizes population deviation and keeps communities together as much as possible.

Mahalo for this opportunity to offer testimony and please do contact me with any questions or requests for additional information.

Me ka ha‘aha‘a,

Ka‘ano‘i Walk, Chair
Kahalu‘u Neighborhood Board #29
January 12, 2022

State of Hawai‘i Reapportionment Commission
reapportionment@hawaii.gov

RE: January 13, 2022 Meeting
Agenda Item V. Presentation of Modified Proposed Final Legislative and Congressional Reapportionment Plans by the Technical Committee Permitted Interaction Group

Aloha e ka Luna Ho`omalu Mark Mugiishi, M.D.,

In our December 15, 2021 Kahaluʻu Neighborhood Board #29 (KNB #29) special meeting, KNB #29 reviewed and discussed the House and Senate redistricting plan proposed by the Commission and also alternative redistricting plans that have been proposed. Our board was very honored to have both Chair Bill Hicks of the Kailua Neighborhood Board #31 and Chair Kimeona Kane of the Waimānalo Neighborhood Board #32 join us to share their insights and understandings of the process and proposals.

Following the review and discussion of the House and Senate redistricting plans proposed, the KNB #29 unanimously passed the following motion:

The Kahaluʻu Neighborhood Board #29 is opposed to the Reapportionment Commission’s proposed plan and SUPPORTS the approach of the Hicks plans for the House and the Senate that includes key concepts that uses Makapuʻu Point as a boundary, minimizes population deviation and keeps communities together as much as possible.

Mahalo for this opportunity to offer testimony and please do contact me with any questions or requests for additional information.

Me ka haʻahaʻa,

Kaʻanoʻi Walk, Chair
Kahaluʻu Neighborhood Board #29
Aloha Reapportionment Commission:

If Oahu has to lose one House District and now has 34 House Districts and 17 Senate Districts, why can’t there be 2 House Districts fully encompassed within each Senate District? So put 2 House Districts into one Senate District.

Or could the House Districts within a Senate District be equally divided into two districts?

The most recent map has unmatching Senate and House lines. Can you please consider putting two House Districts into one Senate District OR dividing one Senate District into two House Districts.

Thank you for your consideration:

Lorna Takehara Strand
99-1440 Aiea Hts. Dr. #26
Aiea, HI 96701
lorna.strand@gmail.com
415 823-0909 cell
January 13, 2022

Aloha Chair Mugiishi and Reapportionment Commission Members,

I am Lisa Bishop, a resident of Oahu. Mahalo for the opportunity to testify today.

Mahalo for reinstating Makapu‘u Point as a natural geographic boundary between HD 51 and HD 18 (old HD 17) as you redrew maps with the revised, final extraction numbers.

However, the new Senate plan does not recognize Makapu‘u Point as a natural geographic boundary, and does not align entire House Districts into Senate Districts. With 17 Senate and 34 House Districts, it is feasible to make the House Districts the best they can be, and then simply combine two House Districts to form each Senate District. The Constitution calls for representative districts to be wholly included within one Senate district if practicable. In the current redistricting draft, only 9 House Districts are wholly inside one Senate District. Some cross over up to 4 Senate Districts.

Please review the new Oahu House and Senate “Hicks Plans” that demonstrate that every Constitutional and HRS criteria is indeed “practicable”. Using those plans as an example, I urge you to apply the State Constitutional mandates to the Senate Districts as well.

Finally, the Congressional Districts should be drawn last, not first, so they also need to be adjusted in this process.

Let’s get this right this time!

Mahalo,

Lisa Bishop
Oahu resident, homeowner, taxpayer and voter
January 5, 2022

Dr. Mark Mugiishi, Chair
Reapportionment Commission
% Mr. Scott Nago, Chief Election Officer
Office of Elections
802 Lehua Avenue
Pearl City, Hawai‘i 96782

Subject: Joint Mānoa Neighborhood Board No. 7 and Makiki/Lower Punchbowl/Tantalus Neighborhood Board No. 10
Opposition to Proposed Reapportionment Plan and Support for Alternative Plan

Aloha Chair Mugiishi, and Reapportionment Commissioners,

The Mānoa Neighborhood Board No. 7 and Makiki/Lower Punchbowl/Tantalus Neighborhood Board No. 10 each reviewed the 2021 House and Senate redistricting plans that were adopted by the Commission.

Two of our Neighborhood Boards had unanimously adopted Resolutions opposed to the previously proposed reapportionment plan. These Boards simultaneously supported an alternative plan that would respect both Makapu‘u Point as a natural boundary between Windward O‘ahu and East Honolulu and Ka‘ena Point between the North Shore and Leeward O‘ahu. The proposed redistricting plan mixes Windward O‘ahu and East Honolulu communities within House District 51, thereby diluting the voice of the Enchanted Lake community as well as the Hawai‘i Kai Portlock community, and negatively impacts the Native Hawaiian voice by squeezing the Waimānalo area between two dissimilar communities and replacing Enchanted Lake with Portlock which has a lower Hawaiian percentage.

Proposed House District 51 is not compact, in its original form it was barely contiguous, and unnecessarily divides the Hawai‘i Kai and Enchanted Lake communities. The same rationale also applies to Senate District 25 (Windward O‘ahu) and Senate District 9 (East Honolulu) where Senate District 25 unnecessarily mixes Windward O‘ahu and East Honolulu communities.

An alternative redistricting plan (known as the “Hicks Plan”) that uses both Makapu‘u Point and Ka‘ena Point as natural boundaries for House and Senate districts demonstrates that it is possible to keep more communities intact, reduce the population deviation between districts, and in particular, not mix Windward Oahu and East Honolulu communities within a legislative district. On December 18, 2021 the Reapportionment Commission posted a final proposed plan that changed the boundaries of 30 of the 35 O‘ahu House districts.

These maps are time stamped as being last modified at 10:38 on December 17, 2021, meaning they were finalized before the O‘ahu Advisory Council, which is chartered by the Hawai‘i Constitution to serve in an advisory capacity to the Reapportionment Commission, had conducted a quorum meeting and provided its recommendations which include using Makapu‘u Point as a boundary. The significant Hawai‘i Kai, Waimānalo, and Kailua issues with the Reapportionment Commission’s original plan approved on October 28, 2021 for public review were made even worse with the final plan! Hawai‘i Kai is split even more. Please look at the following maps and ask which is better?

Mahalo nui loa for considering the Boards’ testimony. Should you have any questions, please contact the Board Chairs by email.

Sincerely,
Opposition to Proposed Reapportionment Plan and Support for Alternative Plan.

Attached: Mānoa Neighborhood Board No. 7 adopted resolution “Requesting The State Of Hawaiʻi Reapportionment Commission To Redraw The Boundaries Of T.G. House District 20, So That It Includes All Of The Residents Of Mānoa Valley.”
REQUESTING THE STATE OF HAWAIʻI REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION
TO REDRAW THE BOUNDARIES OF TG HOUSE DISTRICT 20, SO THAT
IT INCLUDES ALL OF THE RESIDENTS OF MĀNOA VALLEY

WHEREAS Hawaiʻi state law directs the State of Hawaiʻi Reapportionment Commission (ʻCommissionʻ) to redraw, if needed, district boundaries in response to changes in population identified by the decennial United States Census in order to ensure that citizens are equally represented; and

WHEREAS a “district” is the geographical area whose residents are represented by one member of the Hawaiʻi State Legislature; and

WHEREAS Hawaiʻi Revised Statutes, section 25-2(b) lists the criteria by which the Commission will be guided in redrawing the boundaries, and among the criteria are these: “(3) Insofar as practicable, districts shall be compact” and “(4) Where possible, district lines shall follow permanent and easily recognized features such as streets, streams, and clear geographical features”; and

WHEREAS the current boundaries of House District (HD) 23 preserve the integrity of the residents of Mānoa Valley to be part of one legislative district, with the small exception of residents who live on the slopes of Round Top west of Mānoa Road until ʻAleʻo Pl. and then west of Ferdinand until ʻAwapuhi St.; and

WHEREAS the boundaries of the proposed Technical Group (TG) House District 20 has a western boundary that runs along University Ave. as it goes past the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa Campus and then makes a right turn along East Mānoa Rd. and makes a left turn at Lowrey Ave., thus excluding from the TG District 20 all those living east and south of those boundaries, those residents constituting roughly one third of the residents of Mānoa Valley, and instead placing them in TG House District 24; and

WHEREAS to substitute for the loss of residents in the former HD 23, the boundaries move east as far as Koko Head Ave. in Kaimuki in one prong and to Monsarrat Ave. on the slopes of Diamond Head, up to, but not including, Kapʻiolani Community College in the other prong; and

WHEREAS therefore, the boundaries of the proposed TG House District 20 neither make it compact nor follow clear geographical features; and

WHEREAS twenty-two residents of Mānoa, with only 48-hours’ notice, testified in opposition to the Technical Group’s proposed District boundaries; and

WHEREAS for the second meeting of the Reapportionment Commission (October 28, 2021), fifty-one Mānoa residents submitted testimony in opposition to the Technical Group’s boundaries; and
WHEREAS several of these testifiers cited Mānoa Valley’s historical status as one ahupua’a, one watershed; and

WHEREAS the Board of Mālama Mānoa, a community organization representing 4,103 residents of Mānoa Valley, voted unanimously to oppose dividing up Mānoa Valley into TG House Districts 20 and 24; and

WHEREAS the nonpartisan watchdog group Common Cause pointed to the TG House District 20 as a “suspect” district; and

WHEREAS the reapportionment plan of Bill Hicks, Chair of the Kailua Neighborhood Board, contains a House District 23 that includes all of the residents of Mānoa Valley and thus demonstrates that such boundaries can feasibly be drawn within a reapportionment scheme for O’ahu as a whole; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Mānoa Neighborhood Board no. 7 requests that the State of Hawai’i Reapportionment Commission respect the geographical and political integrity of Mānoa Valley by redrawing the district boundaries to include all of Mānoa residents within one House District; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mānoa Neighborhood Board no. 7 supports and endorses the “Hicks Plan” that has been recently presented to the Reapportionment Commission and recommends its consideration for keeping compact, contiguous, and cohesive communities intact, including Mānoa House District 23, Lanikai/Enchanted Lake/Waimānalo HD 51, and Hawai’i Kai HD 17, while achieving a better population balance than the Commission’s Technical Group’s proposal; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the State of Hawai’i Reapportionment Commission, the Senate President, the Speaker of the House, Senator Brian Taniguchi, Representative Dale Kobayashi, and Councilmember Calvin Say.

Elton Fukumoto, Vice Chair
Mānoa Neighborhood Board No. 7

This Letter Was Adopted Without Opposition by the Mānoa Neighborhood Board No. 7, in its Regular Meeting on Wednesday, November 2, 2021.
January 13, 2022

Dear Mr Chair and Members of the Reapportionment Commission:

I am Gordon Aoyagi and am a resident of Honolulu residing in Manoa. Thank you for the work and time you have spent on the Reapportionment Commission. Recently the Commission updated population estimates and is in the process of updating its proposed redistricting plans for 34 House and 17 Senate Districts for Oahu and has posted the Technical Committee’s proposal along with other proposals from the community it has received.

I understand the Commission has received a “Revised Hick’s Plan” for 34 House, 17 Senate and 2 Congressional Districts. I urge the Commission to consider the benefits of the Revised Hick’s Plan as its framework for finalizing its reapportionment plan. It’s reported that the Revised Hick’s Plan has been sent to all the Neighborhood Boards and Mr. Hicks has demonstrated dynamic and real time responsiveness to community concerns as his plans moves towards improvement.

Why use the Revised Hick’s Plan over the TC Proposed Plan? The Revised Hick’s Plan reflects a 2.5% deviation in House Districts while the TC Proposed Plans shows a 4.02% deviation. For the Senate, the Revised Hick’s Plan shows a 1.96% deviation versus the TC Proposed Plan of a 4.93% deviation. Further, the Hick’s Revised Plan complies, is consistent with and demonstrates that all the provisions in the State Constitution for reapportionment are practicable, including containing House District’s wholly within Senate Districts and both State House and Senate District’s wholly within Congressional Districts. Moreover, the proposed districts are totally unbiased and do not give any undue advantage to a person or a party, a key provision also in the Constitution.

The State Constitution is specific in its guidelines and criteria for redistricting. Yet we have heard from Commissioners and staff that those provisions apply only “when practicable”. Research reflects that “practicable” is a term of art with legal, engineering, financial, employment and business definitions. Doing what is “practicable” requires what is fair and reasonable; doing within reasonable natural, social or economic constraints; doing within the state of technical knowledge and the “best practical means”; doing what shows a cost benefit that his better than the alternatives; etc. The Revised Hick’s Plan complies more completely with all the provisions of the State Constitution and has better population deviations that the TC’s proposal. It seems that if the Reapportionment Commission plans to justify its proposed redistricting plan by applying the terms, “where practicable”, then the Commission bears the responsibility of explaining to the public why its proposal is fair and reasonable, is the best practical means, and shows benefits within reasonable natural, social and economic constraints.

While the Commission in the past has developed it’s reapportionment plans behind closed doors and has not provided rationale for its redistricting proposals, it has demonstrated with its consideration of the TC’s proposed plan that it has listened to some of the public testimony. I
am pleased with the collective collaboration, the passion and intensity that the public has shown in this reapportionment process. While in the past, we may have admired our grandparent’s sacrifices “to make the world safe for democracy”, our parents’ or brothers’ and sisters’ answering the call “to advance democracy in foreign lands” - today an awakening has been jolted by recent current events showing how fragile our democracy is. Equality, justice and the rule of law have been our American foundations. I believe today we are witnessing the resurgence of the population’s demand for transparency and accountability in returning to our foundations. Fundamental to the premise are not only unfettered voting rights but also how we are represented.

Please listen to the community and be responsive.

Thank you.

Gordon Aoyagi
We urge you to include Waikoloa Beach Resort in the same Hawaii Island House district as Waikoloa Village and Waimea. We belong to South Kohala, where, for example, we benefit from fire and police protection and from educational and postal services. Our community of interest is the entity that includes Waikoloa Village and Waimea, and that is where we can have meaningful political expression and representation. In such a district we have direct highway and environmental concerns. Past House representatives have been conversant with these concerns as they also relate to Waimea and Waikoloa Village. We have very little in common with Kailua Kona in regard to specific issues that affect us. Consequently, we find ourselves disenfranchised by being lumped with Kona, which is not contiguous with Waikoloa Beach Resort but, rather, separated from us by a vast expanse of largely uninhabited land.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas Delaney
Kathleen Delaney
69-1010 Keana Place
Waikoloa, HI 96738
Dear Commission,

Thank you for your hard work on this project. I am a Waimanalo home owner and I highly support your new plan for district 51. Thank you for hearing our voices about changing back the boundaries to Makapu'u point and your desire to get senate district 25 back to Makapu'u point. These changes to the maps have impacted many communities and we are grateful that you are being sensitive to our voices from all of our communities since Kailua, Waimanalo and Hawaii Kai boards have opposed the earlier decision to combine us into one district.

I am willing to testify orally if possible.

Aloha,
Brenda Wong
ihilanjowong@yahoo.com
808.478.6933
Aloha Reapportionment Staff,

Planning on testifying today at 1pm, submitting this for the record as well.

Mahalo nui,
Shannon M.

Aloha Commissioners,

For the record, my name is Shannon Matson and I was born and raised on Hawai‘i island. At various times I have lived in 7 of the now 8 House Districts and am familiar with our entire island. I have been closely following this redistricting process since the beginning of the 2020 Census. I am particularly concerned about fair process and representation for myself and my neighbors as we currently reside in part of an area on the Big Island that is large enough to fit the entirety of O‘ahu and Maui islands into and yet has had no representatives living in this giant area for the last decade or longer. We are a prime example of taxation without representation. We have the lowest income, and yet pay a larger share of regressive taxes and have the least amount of access to emergency services, healthcare services, and basic infrastructure, including roads, water, electric, and internet connectivity.

I am concerned that this entire process, from the start of the undercounting in the Census to the rushed re-mapping that is occurring now, is diluting our input and minimizing our voices. This process has been confusing, redundant, exhaustive, and not at all transparent.

While I appreciate the efforts of the Commissioners and Staff working through unprecedented times and on an extreme deadline, due to COVID, and a host of other obstacles, I do not want to see the final maps pushed through without proper time for public input. It is crucial that we allow for as much input as we have provided for with maps that were created based on the original extraction process. Hearings need to be conducted specifically in the areas that changes are occurring due to updated extraction numbers, my understanding is those areas are primarily Hawai‘i Island and O‘ahu. We need to have adequate notice of these meetings, they need to be publicly advertised, and we deserve to have the ability to view the public submissions of maps and the Technical Committee’s maps on equal footing. This means we should be able to see them in a side-by-side comparison, or independently with the ability to easily scroll into detailed areas of concern, not just an overlay that appears to give preference to the Tech Committee’s proposal.

I have conducted a review of all the maps submitted for Hawai‘i Island and I believe there are 3 great alternatives to the submission made by the Tech Committee. I will discuss them after I illustrate the problems with the Tech Committee’s map.

I am in strong opposition to the Tech Committee’s proposal for the following reasons: while I appreciate that the deviation is below 5%, the division of districts is horrendous. A frequent criticism by the Commissioners of public maps that were submitted earlier in this process was that some districts were being made “unnecessarily” large. While we all realize large districts are unavoidable in some parts of our island due to low population, the Southern Kona/Ka‘u district was drawn into this map in the LARGEST possible way I have ever seen it in any prior submissions. This is unacceptable due to the issues in lack of representation I have outlined
above. Kea’au cannot possibly be connected to Captain Cook, these communities have completely different needs and it would be impossible for a representative to attempt to bridge that gap in services regularly. In fact, google maps actually suggests that driving outside of the district and going across Saddle road would cut off about 10 minutes of the over 2 hour travel time and is a better solution to connect these two parts of the island that are almost as far away from each other as is possible to get without driving into lower Puna. A similar (although not quite as drastic) problem occurs in connecting the surrounding Hilo communities to Honoka’a. The upper Puna subdivisions are now also divided across multiple districts and connected to Keaukaha. Both Hilo and Kona towns are divided in odd ways. I struggle to see who, if anyone, is benefited by this plan.

I have similar concerns about Hustace v1 and v3. However, the Hustace v2 map I think is a viable solution to many of the problems I outlined above. It is a 9.22% deviation but that could be slightly reduced by H5 going north into H6 a bit and the boundary between H1 and H2 could shift north also to help balance out those numbers.

The Kossow map is probably the most acceptable with a 7.91% that could also potentially be reduced or improved by moving the H2 southern boundary a bit and expanding H3 towards Kea’au. I like this map because at a distance it does a pretty fair job of dividing the large landmass areas into much more equal and manageable chunks. It reduces the largeness of the South Kona/Ka’u area district and puts the Puna districts back together. It also fixes the issue of Hilo communities and Honoka’a being connected and does a better job of keeping downtown Kona together.

The Boyea community map is a clear winner. Not only did Boyea attempt to get as much community input and support as he could possibly do in such a short period of time, but I believe he invited the Commissioners to participate if they wanted to in his process as well. His deviation is the best, with only 3.79% and he also took into account a provision in the mapping criteria that implies where possible House district lines should follow Senate lines. My understanding is this map follows the Senate lines and breaks each Hawai‘i Island Senate district into two House districts. The following issues I have with his map then are really no fault of his own and rather lie with the issues that are already imbedded in the mostly finalized Senate map. This prompts me to suggest that we also reevaluate those lines by making the following adjustments that would correct both of these maps in favor of the needs of our communities.

1. H2 and H3 lines could move slightly east towards Puna to encompass more Hawaiian Homelands area and keep Panaewa area with Keaukaha in H2, not divide that demographic.
2. H3 and H5 lines could shift to put more of Volcano Village together into H3 and not separate that community.
3. The line between H6 and H5 could move north, closer to the line suggested by the Tech Committee to keep a better deviation after making the Volcano switch.
4. Another solution to the deviation/large area in H5 is that we could collectively decide that a larger population gap in H5 is acceptable due to the vastness of the landscape and the fact that this area has been historically underrepresented. By allowing for a bigger population deviation number here, this actually gives the current residents a bigger voice in their government, which I feel would be a small step towards righting a historically monumental wrong that has been done to these populations in the last couple of decades.
5. Beyond the bottom corner of H4 (which is a zero population area) shifting slightly based on which census block was chosen in various maps, all map illustrations kept the H4 area together. I think this is worth noting, as this “lower” Puna population clearly lends itself to being one district and has the population numbers to warrant it. I also think it’s important to
draw attention to the fact that while it doesn’t change the overall deviation numbers, it does change the deviation numbers slightly in the Boyea map to include Pohaku circle and yet they decided to do so anyway due to their commitment to keeping subdivisions/communities connected wherever possible. This is admirable in such an imperfect system, to see such a commitment to strive for inclusion and connection when possible.

In summary, I have shared a few suggestions to improve upon the publicly submitted maps, primarily Kossow and Boyea are the two I would suggest focusing on moving forward. Even if none of my suggestions are incorporated I strongly believe that either of those, or Hustace v2, are a far better representation of what our communities need and want on Hawai‘i Island. I urge the Commission to scrap their plan entirely and move forward with one of the public submissions instead so we can all submit further detailed input and make final adjustments before the deadline.

Mahalo,
Shannon Matson
(808)937-3037
Dear Reapportionment Commission,

I am a resident of Manoa Valley now for 12 years, and previously of the Windward side for 30 years. I am writing regarding the updated population estimates and your proposed redistricting maps.

Having attended your sessions for some time, I stand in support of the “Revised Hick’s Plan” and urge the Commission to consider the benefits of that Plan and use it for the final Apportionment map. To do so would result in lower deviations than the Technical Committee map, while following the State Constitution closely without regard to any current incumbent or party.

The people of Honolulu have been quite outspoken about our preferences, which are to follow the State Constitution as closely as possible. I urge you to respect our voices.

Mahalo for your work through all this.

Best regards,

Gail Baron

Manoa
Aloha,

I am writing to express my support for the House Redistricting Map submitted as the Hawai‘i Island Community Map (Ralph Boyea). This layout, and similarly the Kossow map, keep the districts more equitable in terms of the road miles that must be covered by a legislator or candidate to represent their constituents, keep neighborhoods that seem more similar and connected in districts together, and meet all statutory requirements.

The biggest challenge presented by the proposed technical committee map is the breadth of coverage of District 5, which would make it impractical and impracticable to provide adequate representation to all citizens of that district.

Mahalo for your consideration,

Springer Kaye
--
Springer Kaye
Manager
Big Island Invasive Species Committee
23 E. Kawili St.
Hilo, HI 96720

(808) 933-3340
www.biisc.org
www.plantpono.org

*BIISC is a project of the Pacific Cooperative Studies Unit (PCSU) University of Hawai‘i at Manoa.*
January 13, 2022
1pm Meeting

Will verbally testify.

Aloha and good afternoon Chair Dr. Mark Mugiishi and members of the Commission. My name is May Mizuno. I am a Kalihi Valley resident and currently the chair of the Kalihi Valley Neighborhood Board #16. However, I am testifying today as an individual citizen and a long time resident and community advocate of Kalihi Valley and the entire State of Hawaii and I am currently at my lunch break from work.

I stand in support of the Commission's new proposed Redistricting plan and I want to reiterate what I have said the last time I testified. I understand that there is a process and part of the process is to allow individuals to submit their own plan. However, some individuals may submit their own proposal with the intent to have personal gain or to force blue collar districts like our district, which already have the highest density of public housing and prisons, to be cut up thus becoming fragmented because of the desire of rich districts.

One of the reasons why I support the commission's proposed draft is because I trust that this has been done thoroughly with no hidden agenda and is fair for everyone.

Kalihi Valley is a blue collar working community and a significant number of us are immigrants and we normally are quite and we do not complain or speak up because our community is united and we all work closely together as one OHANA just to make ends meet and live in peace. We do not complain that we have the highest number of public housing in our community. We do not complain that we have the Oahu Correctional Center (OCCC) in lower Kalihi. We do not grumble because we care. The rich communities never want public housing or a prison in their community.

Kalihi Valley community needs to be intact as we are a unique and united community. Dividing us is the same as dividing a family and this is detrimental to all of us Kalihi residents. We are also the only district in the State to have established a Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ), to ensure adequate parking for the area residents. Kalihi Valley was able to achieve this program by being united. If Kalihi is split through Likelike Highway it will divide the current RPZ in half and will adversely affect the ability to finalize the RPZ Program, which will eventually become a blueprint for other districts in the state to implement.

We thank the Commission for listening to people from all districts and being objective and fair in your final plan. The blue collar working community of Kalihi Valley thanks you for listening to our concerns and addressing them in a prudent manner.

Kudos to all of you!
Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

May Mizuno
Kalihi Valley Resident

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Aloha Chair Mugiishi, and Reapportionment Commissioners:

I am grateful for the opportunity to submit testimony at today’s hearing. This testimony is submitted in my personal, individual capacity.

I recognize that significant improvements have been made and this map is close to meeting the requests that I have made to the Commission during my previous. However, I am testifying in opposition to Modified Redistricting Plans Based on the Adopted Revised Permanent Resident Population Data Adopted on 1/6/22 due to possible negative social and economic impacts on a Native Hawaiian community in my area.

This proposal limits the capacity of those living in the Hawaiian Home Lands of Papakōlea, Kewalo, and Kalāwahine from expressing their concerns and political preferences together. This occurs because these communities are bisected between the proposed House Districts 26 and 27. While it is true that this is not far from the status quo with regards to the current placement of the district lines, it is new to the proposals made by this Reapportionment Commission. I recognize that this placement of the boundary line may have been made unintentionally while the Reapportionment Commission was working diligently to resolve the concerns of other communities. Fortunately, I believe that this problem may be resolved with a relatively simple adjustment.

I have no personal preference for which House District these Native Hawaiian committees are included in, just that they remain intact. However, in corresponding with local community leaders, there appears to be a general preference for being included in the proposed House District 26. I believe the difference in population could potentially be made by shifting the boundary line around Punchbowl, which often and currently serves as a shifting boundary line between these districts.

Additionally, in speaking with neighbors in the areas around Nehoa St. and Dominis St. near the border with Proposed House Districts 26 and 22, I have found that there is a general feeling that too much of Makiki is being moved into the Mānoa District (proposed House District 22). Important community members who are synonymous with Makiki are moved into another District under this proposal. Often Punahou St. is seen as a relatively agreeable community boundary line. While that boundary might not be possible at this time due to other considerations, I humbly request that further consideration be taken in how more of this area may remain in House District 26.

Mahalo for your considerations,
Ian Ross
Aloha Mr. Ian Ross,

Attached is a letter from Papakolea Hawaiian Civic Club against splitting of Papakolea into two different districts.

Please let me know how we can help! My contact information is taiulu@yahoo.com or (808) 291-5038.

Mahalo nui,

Kealii Lum
Pelekikena PHCC
1/13/2022

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is being written against the splitting of Papakolea Community in half for the next decade. As President of the Papakolea Hawaiian Civic Club under the Association of Hawaiian Civic clubs our voice is much stronger within the community when we are together. Separating the community into two different districts limits our voice for any action or resolutions for important issues we face.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions at (808) 291-5038 or email me at taiulu@yahoo.com

Mahalo Nui Loa,

Kealii Lum
President, PHCC
Aloha Hard-working Commissioners,
I have reviewed the map of the Technical Committee and the various community maps being offered, and I believe that Ralph Boyea’s map (with the input of many community members including myself) is the map that best represents the disparate rural and urban communities. Having lived in the same rural community for 40 years, I can attest to the fact that our representation is nil (zero) when we are represented by someone based in the city of Hilo, and that person has NEVER attended a meeting in our rural communities once. That is why I think it is important not to lump the rural areas with urban areas. I most certainly do NOT want my district to be represented by someone that must represent Kurtistown to Captain Cook—it would take two hours to even drive that district! Please consider the districts outlined in the Boyea map. Thank you!
Deborah Ward
Aloha Commissioners
I am Elizabeth Jenkins, 20 year resident of Ka'u district, Kiolaka'a Ahupua'a. I want to affirm that I am in strong opposition to the Tech Committee’s proposal of this redistricting map for the following reasons: while I appreciate that the deviation is below 5%, the division of districts is horrendous. A frequent criticism by the Commissioners of public maps that were submitted earlier in this process was that some districts were being made “unnecessarily” large. While we all realize large districts are unavoidable in some parts of our island due to low population, the Southern Kona/Ka’u district was drawn into this map in the LARGEST possible way I have ever seen it, in any prior submission. This is unacceptable due to the issues in lack of representation that would profoundly affect us, the residents of this largest district.

As an organic farmer from Ka'u my needs cannot be lumped together with the good people of Captain Cook and Kea'au in Hilo. That is simply unacceptable.

Thank you for hearing my voice!

Mahalo Nui,
Elizabeth Jenkins and
Barney Frazier, owners of ’Ailani Orchards farm
Vice President of Kiolaka'a Homeowners Association

Elizabeth B. Jenkins,
Farmer, Author, Director of Wiraqocha Foundation
www.ailaniorchards.com
www.elizabethbjenkins.com
www.thefourthlevel.org
Aloha,
Please find my testimony for the Reapportionment meeting on 1/13/22 attached. I plan to testify orally as well.
Thank you,
Becky Gardner

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Rebecca Gardner <beckypgardner@icloud.com>
Date: Thu, Jan 13, 2022 at 12:57 PM
Subject:
To: <policymattersllc@gmail.com>
January 6, 2022

Re: Public Testimony on Reapportionment Commission Meeting January 3, 202

Aloha, Commissioners:

My name is Becky Gardner and I am submitting this testimony on behalf of myself and as Owner & Principal of Policy Matters LLC. In my testimony today, I want to express: (1) my appreciation for the Commission’s decision to work with the most recent extraction data provided by the military, and its defense of its approach and interpretation of Act 14 at a recent legislative informational briefing; (2) support the operating procedures established by the recent discussions between Reapportionment Commission Staff and the data managers with the military; and (3) share some of the legislative history on Act 14.

First, I believe the Commission represented its position and interpretations of Act 14 very well, explaining the rigorous processes it undertook at a legislative briefing on Monday. I also believe that so much was accomplished by the recent discussions between the data managers at the military and Reapportionment Commission Staff. I respectfully request that we recognize how far we’ve come in understanding how to work with the data, and to carefully outline these processes in the Reapportionment Commission’s report at the conclusion of this process.

Second, I support the plans created and submitted by community members which are more effective at: minimizing population deviations; creating districts that are compact and contiguous; respecting natural boundaries; placing house districts within single senate districts; and not crossing the lines of congressional districts. I believe these community-created maps have been carefully constructed with significant public input. These community-driven maps achieve constitutional and legislative requirements to a greater extent practicable, and in ways that mindfully start with house districts that will be joined to form Senate Districts; then join two house districts to form one senate district; and then construct congressional districts using whole house districts. By approaching the districting process in this order, great care and attention to community-level detail have been given to the process of creating more ideal house districts, where such detail is most important. I appreciate this approach as I think this is most consistent with constitutional mandates and serves the public best.

Finally, for the edification of those trying to understand the impetus and intent behind Act 14 (SB1350 CD1), I provide the following legislative history and opinions by our State Attorney General.

---

**SB1350:**

Report Title:
Office of Public Accountability; Auditor; Ombudsman; OIP; State Ethics Commission; Campaign Spending Commission; Appropriation

Description:
Establishes the office of public accountability to assume oversight and administrative responsibility for the office of the auditor, office of the ombudsman, office of information practices, Hawaii state ethics commission, and campaign spending commission. Appropriates funds.
NO LANGUAGE ON REAPPORTIONMENT

SB1350 Proposed SD1

Report Title:
Legislative Reapportionment; Permanent Residents; Short Form Public Notice Requirements; Appropriation

Description:
Defines "permanent resident" for legislative reapportionment purposes, as a person whose usual residence is in the State as defined by the US Census Bureau. Establishes public notice requirements for short form public notices. Appropriates an unspecified amount to allow the Commission to obtain outside legal counsel with funds expended by the Office of Elections. (Proposed SD1)

SECTION 3. Section 25-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) Legislative reapportionment. The commission shall reapportion the members of each house of the legislature on the basis, method, and criteria prescribed by the Constitution of the United States and article IV of the Hawaii Constitution. For purposes of legislative reapportionment, in determining the permanent resident population, a "permanent resident" means any person whose usual residence is in the State as defined by the United States Census Bureau.

From the Committee Report on SB1350/SB1350 Proposed SD1 on Reapportionment:

Your Committees find that the Reapportionment Commission, in determining reapportionment, must first determine the total number of members to which the State is entitled then apportion those members among districts so that the average number of persons in the total population counted in the last preceding United States Census per member in each district shall be nearly equal as practicable. In February 2011, the U.S. Census Bureau announced it will likely delay delivery of the 2020 census results to the fifty states by as much as six months or more. This will significantly delay the reapportionment of federal, state, and county districts.

Your Committees further find that after experiencing delays in preparing the reapportionment plan following the 2010 census, the State of Hawaii 2011 Reapportionment Commission Final Report and Reapportionment Plan made recommendations to improve the reapportionment process for the future. The Hawaii Revised Statutes requires the Reapportionment Commission to act by majority vote of its membership and establish its own procedures except as provided by law. This measure therefore implements a recommendation of the 2011 Reapportionment Commission Final Report and Reapportionment Plan by clarifying that the definition of a "permanent resident", for purposes to legislative reapportionment, is the same as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, thereby assisting the Reapportionment Commission to determine an accurate count of the permanent resident population of the State.

SB1350 SD1

Report Title:
Legislative Reapportionment; Permanent Residents; Short Form Public Notice Requirements; Appropriation

Description:
Temporarily amends the start of filing nomination papers for the 2022 Election. Defines "permanent resident" for legislative reapportionment purposes, to be consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of permanent resident. Establishes public notice requirements for short form public notices of reapportionment plans. Appropriates an unspecified amount to the Reapportionment Commission for its expenses, which include obtaining outside legal counsel. (SD1)
SECTION 4. Section 25-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) Legislative reapportionment. The commission shall reapportion the members of each house of the legislature on the basis, method, and criteria prescribed by the Constitution of the United States and article IV of the Hawaii Constitution. For purposes of legislative reapportionment, in determining the permanent resident population, a "permanent resident" is as defined by the United States Census Bureau."

The State Attorney General testified on the SD1 on March 16, 2021 before the House Committee on JUDICIARY & HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS as follows:

“Section 4 amends section 25-2(a), Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), on page 6, lines 7-9 of the bill to adopt the recommendation of the 2011 Reapportionment Commission Final Report to clarify the term “permanent resident” by providing that “‘permanent resident’ is as defined by the United States Census Bureau.” The U.S. Census Bureau provided guidance regarding where persons are counted during the 2020 Census in the Final 2020 Census Residence Criteria and Residence Situations (2020 Census Residence Criteria) published in the Federal Register on February 8, 2018. However, the 2020 Census Residence Criteria does not appear to include a definition of “permanent resident.”

Rather, the 2020 Census Residence Criteria confirms that U.S. Census Bureau’s enumeration procedures are guided by the concept of “usual residence,” which is the place where a person lives and sleeps most of the time. 83 Fed. Reg. 5, 526 (Feb. 8, 2018). Thus, to the extent the bill attempts to define “permanent resident” as any “usual resident” counted by the U.S. Census Bureau, the definition might run afoul of the language in sections 4 and 6 of article IV of the Hawai‘i State Constitution, as interpreted by the Hawai‘i Supreme Court.

Section 4 of article IV of the Hawai‘i State Constitution states:
The commission shall allocate the total number of members of each house of the state legislature being reapportioned among the four basic island units, namely: (1) the island of Hawaii, (2) the islands of Maui, Lanai, Molokai and Kahoolawe, (3) the island of Oahu and all other islands not specifically enumerated, and (4) the islands of Kauai and Niihau, using the total number of permanent residents in each of the basic island units and computed by the method known as the method of equal proportions; except that no basic island unit shall receive less than one member in each house. (Emphasis added).

Section 6 of article IV of the Hawai‘i State Constitution states in relevant part:
Upon the determination of the total number of members of each house of the state legislature to which each basic island unit is entitled, the commission shall apportion the members among the districts therein and shall redraw district lines where necessary in such manner that for each house the average number of permanent residents per member in each district is as nearly equal to the average for the basic island unit as practicable. (Emphasis added).

The term “permanent resident” is not defined in the Hawai‘i State Constitution. However, the term appears in both sections 4 and 6 of article IV and therefore restricts the members of Hawai‘i’s population base for purposes of apportioning members of the state legislature and drawing district lines to permanent (as opposed to non-permanent) residents (as opposed to non-residents). Moreover, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court has issued two decisions relevant to the meaning of this term in this context: Citizens for Equitable and Responsible Government v. County of Hawaii, 108 Haw. 318, 120 P.3d 217 (2005), and Solomon v. Abercrombie, 126 Haw. 283, 270 P.3d 1013 (2012). These cases suggest the Hawai‘i Supreme Court might find that the federal census count cannot be used as a population base unless nonpermanent residents are first extracted.
Legislative Reapportionment; Permanent Residents; Short Form Public Notice Requirements; Appropriation

Description:
Establishes public notice requirements for short form public notices of reapportionment plans. Temporarily amends the start of filing nomination papers for the 2022 election. Defines "permanent resident" for legislative reapportionment purposes. Authorizes and appropriates funds for the reapportionment commission to retain outside legal counsel. (HD1)

SECTION 4. Section 25-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) Legislative reapportionment. The commission shall reapportion the members of each house of the legislature on the basis, method, and criteria prescribed by the Constitution of the United States and article IV of the Hawaii State Constitution. For purposes of legislative reapportionment, in determining the permanent resident population, a "permanent resident" is as defined by Solomon v. Abercrombie, 126 Haw. 283 (2012)."

The State Attorney General testified on the HD1 on April 7, 2021 before the House Committee on FINANCE as follows:

"Page 6, lines 9-12 of the bill provides that, “[f]or purposes of legislative reapportionment, in determining the permanent resident population, a ‘permanent resident’ is as defined by Solomon v. Abercrombie, 126 Haw. 283, 270 P.3d 1013 (2012).” However, Solomon did not define the term “permanent resident”; rather, it determined that non-permanent residents should be excluded from the permanent resident population base. In Solomon, the Hawaiʻi Supreme Court entertained two challenges to the validity of the 2011 Final Reapportionment Plan, both of which contended the plan was invalid because the population base used by the Reapportionment Commission excluded some, but not all of the nonresident college students and nonresident military personnel and their dependents. 126 Haw. 283, 293, 270 P.3d 1013, 1023. Reaffirming that the Hawaiʻi State Constitution mandates “only residents having their domiciliary in the State of Hawaiʻi may be counted in the population base for the purpose of reapportioning the legislative districts,” the Court concluded that the failure to exclude non-permanent residents from the population base was an error that rendered the reapportionment plan constitutionally invalid. Id. at 292-293, 270 P.3d at 1022-1023. The Department therefore recommends the bill be amended by either deleting the proposed definition or by deleting the reference to Solomon and clarifying the definition of the term “permanent resident.”"

There was a floor amendment in the House on April 13, 2021 which removed all amendments to HRS 25-2.

No testimony was accepted on the SD1 HD1 HFA1, nor on the CD1.

SB1350 SD1 HD2 CD1

Report Title:
Deferred Salary Adjustments; State Positions; Legislative Reapportionment; Permanent Residents; Short Form Public Notice Requirements; Appropriation

Description:
Part I: Extends the deferment of further implementation of the executive and judicial branch salary increases as well as planned raises for members of the legislature. Effective 6/29/2021. Part II: Establishes public notice requirements for short form public notices of reapportionment plans. Temporarily amends the start date for the availability of nomination papers for 2022 primary
election. Defines "permanent resident" for legislative reapportionment purposes. Authorizes and appropriates funds to the reapportionment commission. (CD1)

SECTION 5. Section 25-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is amended by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) Legislative reapportionment. The commission shall reapportion the members of each house of the legislature on the basis, method, and criteria prescribed by the Constitution of the United States and article IV of the Hawaii State Constitution. [Pursuant thereto, the] For purposes of legislative reapportionment, a "permanent resident" means a person having the person's domiciliary in the State. In determining the total number of permanent residents for purposes of reapportionment among the four basic island units, the commission shall only extract non-permanent residents from the total population of the State counted by the United States Census Bureau for the respective reapportionment year."

The Conference Committee on April 23, 2021 stated:

“Your Committee on Conference addresses the Reapportionment Commission's recommendation to clarify the definition of a "permanent resident" by requiring only the extraction of non-permanent residents from the total population of the State as counted by the U.S. Census Bureau. Obtaining specific data, rather than estimates, should result in an actual count of non-residents; and thereby provide a count of the permanent resident population of the State. In addition, the streamlined form of notice for reapportionment plans proposed by this measure is projected to result in significant cost savings, while also providing adequate notice to the public of the Reapportionment Commission's actions and the availability of the Reapportionment Plan and other related documents.”

The July 1, 2021 Opinion letter from the Attorney General is provided after my signature below – with additional guidance on the interpretation of Act 14.

In my opinion, the amendments to HRS 25-2 in Act 14 have only muddied the waters; and I recommend this Commission provide its experience and interpretations of this statutory amendment in its final report.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

Sincerely,

Rebecca (Becky) Gardner, Esq.
July 1, 2021

The Honorable Laura Acasio
State Capitol, Room 203
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Senator Acasio:

Re: Legal Opinion Relating to Reapportionment

This is in response to your letter dated June 9, 2021, in which you requested that our office provide a legal opinion relating to the upcoming reapportionment and possible interpretations of Act 14, Session Laws of Hawaii 2021 (“Act 14”). Specifically, you asked the following questions:

1. Under an analysis of Article IV, Sections 4 and 6 of the Hawaii State Constitution; HRS Chapter 25; Solomon v. Abercrombie, 126 Haw. 283, 270 P.3d 1013 (2012); Citizens for Equit. & Respon. Gov’t v. County, 108 Haw. 318, 120 P.3d 217 (2005); and any other relevant law – and despite the absence of a definition of “domiciliary” in the amended language of HRS § 25-2 that will take effect on July 1 pursuant to Act 14, what can the term “domiciliary” be interpreted to mean other than the residence of a “permanent resident” of Hawaii as clarified by the Hawaii Supreme Court decision in Solomon?; and

2. Notwithstanding the answer to Question 1 above and given the “two-step” process of reapportionment outlined in Solomon, can the amended language of HRS § 25-2, provided in Act 14 “[i]n determining the total number of permanent residents for purposes of apportionment among the four basic island units, the commission shall only extract non-permanent residents from the total population of the State counted by the United States Census Bureau for the respective reapportionment year” (underlining added), be interpreted to mean that the extraction of non-permanent residents, as clarified by Solomon, will be applied “only” to “step one” – “Apportionment Among Basic Island Units” [underlining added] made pursuant to Article IV, Section 4 of the Hawaii State Constitution; and not to “step two” – “Apportionment Within Basic Island Units” made pursuant to Article IV, Section 6?
Pursuant to Act 14, HRS § 25-2(a) provides in relevant part:

For purposes of legislative reapportionment, a “permanent resident” means a person having the person’s domiciliary in the State. In determining the total number of permanent residents for purposes of apportionment among the four basic island units, the commission shall only extract non-permanent residents from the total population of the State counted by the United States Census Bureau for the respective reapportionment year.

With respect to question number 1, we understand your inquiry to be related to the interpretation of the term “domiciliary” as it is used in the definition of “permanent resident” in HRS § 25-2. It is well-established that,

[domicile is proved by evidence of two facts: physical presence at a particular place and intention of the party to reside there permanently; or, as is sometimes said, to make the place his home with no present intent to leave at any foreseeable future time.

Matter of Estate of Marcos, 88 Hawai‘i 148, 154, 963 P.2d 1124, 1130 (1998) (emphasis in original). Residence, alone, is insufficient to establish Hawaii as one’s domicile; there must also be an intent to make Hawaii the person’s home with no present intent to leave in the foreseeable future. Id. Thus, for purposes of legislative reapportionment, a “permanent resident” is one who physically resides in the State and intends to make the State his home with no present intent to leave in the foreseeable future.

With respect to question number 2, we understand you to be asking whether non-permanent residents may also be extracted for purposes of completing “step two” of the reapportionment process. To the extent that there is sufficient data to identify non-permanent residents, we answer in the affirmative. Reapportionment is a two-step process: first, apportionment among the four basic island units, and second, apportionment within the four basic island units. Haw. Const. art. IV, §§ 4 and 6; see also Solomon v. Abercrombie, 126 Hawai‘i 283, 292, 270 P.3d 1013, 1022 (2012). In step one, the Commission is required to “allocate the total number of members of each house of the state legislature being reapportioned among the basic island units... using the total number of permanent residents in each basic island unit[.]” Haw. Const. art. IV, § 4 (emphasis added). In step two:

[upon the determination of the total number of members of each house of the state legislature to which each basic island unit is entitled, the commission shall apportion the members among the districts therein and shall redraw district lines where necessary in such manner that for each house the average number of permanent residents per member in each district is as nearly equal to the average for the basic island unit as practicable.

1 Section 5 of Act 14 took effect upon approval by the Governor on May 17, 2021.
The Honorable Laura Acasio  
July 1, 2021  
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Haw. Const. art. IV, § 6 (emphasis added). Although separate processes, both steps require the Commission to identify a “permanent resident” population. Solomon, 126 Hawai‘i at 293, 270 P.3d at 1023. Inasmuch as only permanent residents “may be counted in the population base for the purpose of reappportioning legislative districts,” the Commission is required to extract non-permanent residents where it has sufficient data to identify such residents, notwithstanding the fact that HRS § 25-2 does not expressly prescribe such conduct. Id. at 292.-293, 270 P.3d at 1022-23.

We hope this adequately addresses your questions. Please feel free to contact us should you have any further questions.

Very Truly Yours,

/s/ Lori N. Tanigawa

Lori N. Tanigawa  
Deputy Attorney General

APPROVED:  

Clare E. Connors  
Attorney General
Aloha Redistricting Commission,

My name is Kawohi Acopan-Tuasivi and I was born and raised here in Papakōlea, where I continue to reside and raise my keiki today. This recent news about dividing our community due to "new census data used to redraw the lines for the House and Senate, as well as other additional elections" is unacceptable. This will not only implicate "who is elected, what types of projects are approved or blocked, and the (potential) laws that are passed", the ramifications of dividing our voice as Hawaiians, specific and unique issues of our people, will be greatly impacted. Not in just the next 10 years, but potentially for future generations. Once we allow this change to occur, it may never be reversed or corrected! This is serious and not warranted! Not all data is reliable and accurate! Please express the dire state of influence that this decision will have on our Papakōlea Community. I strongly agree that placing Papakōlea into 2 or more separate districts "will limit how much voters and residents will have our views represented". This is unacceptable! Our voice as Hawaiians, the native and host culture of our Hawaii, must remain together always. Please respect our requests and concerns for Papakōlea to remain unified in one district.

Mahalo for your time and attention,
Dr. C. Kawohi Acopan-Tuasivi, EdD
5th Generation Resident of Papakōlea
Aloha Commission,

Mahalo for your continual work of hearing the voices and concerns of the people in regards to the maps & reapportionment of the districts of O‘ahu. I am in support of your new plan for district 51. As someone who has been shaped by the communities, families & ‘āina of Waimānalo, who has ‘Ohana in Waimānalo and who cares about Waimānalo’s future, I mahalo you for continuing to do your best to support and uphold the desires of the Waimānalo community.

Ke aloha i ke AKUA,

Moanike‘ala Nanod-Sitch
moani.sitch@intervarsity.org
808.3427896
Aloha Commission Members: I’m writing to state my dissatisfaction with your current proposed plan & register my approval of the H8 Community Plan, or ‘Boyea Plan’. Mahalo for considering my comments, Jeanne Wheeler - Pahoa, 96778

Sent from my iPhone
Aloha,

Thank you for your work on this issue of Reapportionment. We know that this is part of the bedrock of our democracy and that we must get this right to ensure trust, accountability and fairness.

Although I am Executive Director of The Outdoor Circle, and have also served on the NB#5, I am testifying as a private citizen today who is active in the local Diamond Head-Kapahulu area, however I know that the Diamond Head-Kapahulu-St Louis Heights Neighborhood Board has also submitted opposition to the original HRC plan.

I want to express my appreciation for the recently improved HRC plan yet recognize that we still have a way to go and support the Revised Hicks Plan of 1.9.22 before you which meets a number of Constitutionally mandated requirements as set forth in Hawaii State Constitution Article IV Section 6: namely, that districts be compact, contiguous, follow easily recognized natural features, that House Districts be contained within Senate Districts, that population deviations be minimized. These are not suggestions and are practical and reasonable.

I will speak to my area of the city specifically. The Final Technical Committee Plan divides the Diamond Head area unnaturally into two Senate Districts. Namely, Senate District 9 as proposed in the HRC plan combines such disparate areas such as the Gold Coast on Kapiolani Park and Kapahulu Fire Station areas with areas extending to Eastern Maunalua Bay, almost to Costco. As mentioned by many, the current Final Technical Committee Plan plan for Senate District 25 combines Portlock and much of Hawaii Kai with areas far up the Windward Coast.

This contrasts with the Hicks Plan, which keeps East Honolulu as a whole entity ending naturally at Makapuu for Senate District 9 and keeps the area surrounding Diamond Head naturally within Senate District 10.

The Revised Hicks Plan also keeps the Diamond Head House District 20 completely within Senate District 25. The Final Technical Committee Plan illogically and unnaturally joins the residential area behind Kapahulu Safeway to House District 23 which itself extends to the area around Walmart. This Final Technical Committee Plan breaks the Kapahulu neighborhood unnecessarily and is against guidelines, and I would urge the Commission to rejoin the residential area behind Kapahulu Safeway together again to the Manoa Stream to where it joins Kapiolani at Market City.

There is one specific suggestion I have in any final plan and that is that for the non-residential areas that include Kaimuki High School, Crane Park and Market City Shopping Center be included in the Diamond Head House District 20 and Senate District 9 as proposed in the Revised Hicks Plan. This combined non-residential area has traditionally been included in the Diamond Head-Kapahulu region and is part of the Diamond Head Kapahulu St Louis Heights Neighborhood Board #5. This area is on the same side of the Manoa-Palolo Stream and is integrally connected via back yards with the Kapahulu neighborhood and should be re-attached to House District 20 in any plan, and certainly not attached to House District 23 nor any other district.

There are other examples that other testifiers have addressed where the Final Technical Committee Plan does not seem to meet the Constitutional requirements, and I urge you to consider the Revised Hicks plan, Neighborhood Board input, as well as the excellent additional input from others before
you as the basis for reapportionment. Mahalo for your time and service.

Mahalo for your time,

Winston Welch
My name is Amy Stone Murai. I have been a homeowner/resident in Moanalua Valley for more than 30 years. I thank the commission for considering community feedback, and write today to support the Commission's 1/13/22 proposed reapportionment map that again unites the whole Moanalua region in a way that is sensible and fair.