

HAWAII COUNCIL OF ASSOCIATIONS  
OF APARTMENT OWNERS

P.O. Box 726  
Aiea, Hawaii 96701  
Telephone (808) 566-2122

LATE TESTIMONY

February 25, 2008

Rep. Kyle Yamashita, Chair  
Rep. Glen Wakai, Vice-Chair  
House Committee on Economic Development & Business Concerns  
State Capitol  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE: HB 1075, Re Real Property  
Hearing: Tues., Feb. 26, 2008, 10 a.m., Conf. Rm. #325

Chair Yamashita and Vice-Chair Wakai and Members of the Committee:

I am Jane Sugimura, President of the Hawaii Council of Associations of Apartment Owners (HCAAO).

HCAAO supports this bill with the following revisions:


Change Section 2 of the bill to read as follows:

"(a) Anything to the contrary notwithstanding, any ground lease that is encumbered by a commercial or industrial lease of more than twenty years shall be subject to following terms and conditions: . . .


(b)(3) That is subject to a ground lease of more than twenty years."

According to a recent Advertiser new article, industrial lessees in the Mapunapuna/Kalihi area are being threatened with high lease rent that will drive many of them out of the area or make them close their businesses. This will affect apartment owners in that area as well as in other parts of Oahu since they will have to pay higher prices for the goods and services currently being offered by those lessees.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

  
Jane Sugimura  
President

HB1075LEASERFREEDOM.TSY.DOC



LAND USE RESEARCH  
FOUNDATION OF HAWAII  
700 Bishop Street, Ste. 1928  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  
Phone 521-4717  
Fax 536-0132

LATE TESTIMONY

February 26, 2008

BY E-MAIL

The Honorable Representative Kyle Yamashita, Chair, and Members  
Committee on Economic Development & Business Concerns  
State House of Representatives, Room 325  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

**RE: House Bill No. HB 1075 Relating to Real Property  
(Lease alterations to favor long-term lessees)**

Dear Chair Yamashita and Members:

My name is David Arakawa, and I am the Executive Director of the Land Use Research Foundation of Hawaii (LURF), a private non-profit research and trade association whose members include major Hawaii landowners, developers and a utility company. One of LURF's missions is to advocate for reasonable and rational land use planning, legislation and regulations affecting common problems in Hawaii.

LURF appreciates the opportunity to provide our testimony **in opposition to H.B. No. 1075. LURF is opposed to this bill** because it **violates the Contracts Clause** (Article I, Section 10) of the United States Constitution ("U.S. Constitution"). It is unconstitutional because (1) it will cause the alteration of existing long-term lease contracts and would substantially impair the contractual relationship of such leases; (2) the proposed bill is not designed to promote a significant and legitimate public purpose; and (3) the proposed law is not a reasonable and narrowly-drawn means of promoting the significant and legitimate public purpose. Moreover, prior legal opinions issued by the State of Hawaii's Department of the Attorney General ("Attorney General") have repeatedly cautioned that analogous legislation, which altered existing contract rights to the detriment of lessors and to the benefit of lessees, would violate the Contracts Clause of the U.S. Constitution

**H.B. No. 1075.** The alleged purpose of this bill is to alter certain lease conditions in existing long-term leases of commercial and industrial properties and to provide a tax benefit for lessors who sell the leasehold interest and all improvements to lessees. The proposed H.B. No. 1075 would change certain terms of the original lease agreement between parties to the detriment of the lessor and to the benefit of the lessee by, among other things:

- 1) Altering the existing contract rights of lessors to withhold approvals for the assignment, transfer, or encumbrance of leasehold property;

- 2) Altering the existing contract terms which would require lessees to make substantial new improvements to infrastructure or structures, by changing the contract requirement to making reasonable maintenance and repair work to satisfy laws, ordinances and code requirements....;
- 3) Altering the contract terms which require the reversion of any improvements on the leasehold property at the termination of the lease; and
- 4) Altering the contract terms which provide for the calculations of periodic step-ups in lease rent.

**Background of similar and comparable unconstitutional legislation which altered lease terms to the benefit of lessees and to the detriment of lessors.**

Over the past several years, legislation has been introduced with the recurring theme of legislatively altering the terms and conditions of existing leases to the benefit of lessees and to the detriment of lessors:

- In 2007, S.B. No 1252 and S.B. No. 1619, proposed virtually identical alterations of existing lease contract to favor the lessee;
- In 2006, S.B. No. 2043, would have imposed a surcharge tax on the value of improvements to real property subject to reversion in a lease of commercial or industrial property;
- In 2000, SB 873 SD 1 HD 2 also attempted to alter existing lease contract terms to the detriment of lessors and to the benefit of lessees by proposing to alter existing lease terms to require a lessor to purchase a lessee's improvements at the expiration of the lease term. The Department of Attorney General opined that SB 873 SD1, HD2, violated the Contracts Clause (Article I, Section 10) of the U.S. Constitution, as follows: "S.B. No. 873, as presently worded, will substantially impair existing leases without furthering any apparent public purpose... [It is] unlikely that S.B. No. 873 will be found to be a 'reasonable and narrowly-drawn means of promoting... [a] significant and legitimate public purpose.'" Governor Cayetano relied on the Attorney General's opinion, and vetoed S.B. No. 873, SD1, HD1.
- In 2001, in response to H.B. No. 1131, HD1, yet another bill which proposed to alter existing lease contracts to favor lessees, the Attorney General again reaffirmed its opinion that the proposed bill violated the Contracts Clause of the U.S. Constitution.
- In 1987, in the Hawaii Supreme Court case of Anthony v. Kualoa Ranch, 69 Haw. 112, 736 P.2d 55 (1987). The Court ruled that a statute requiring a lessor to purchase a lessee's improvements at the expiration of the lease term violated the Contracts Clause. The Court observed that: "This statute, as applied to leases already in effect, purely and simply, is an attempt by the legislature to change contractual remedies and obligations, to the detriment of all lessors and to the benefit of all lessees, without relation to the purposes of the leasehold conversion act; without the limitations as to leaseholds subject thereto contained in the conversion provisions; not in the exercise of the eminent domain power; but simply for the purpose of doing equity, as the legislature saw it. If there is any meaning at all to the contract clause, it prohibits the application of HRS §516-70 to leases existing at the time of the 1975 amendment. Accordingly, that section, as applied to leases existing at the time of the adoption of the 1975 amendment, is declared unconstitutional."

**H.B. No. 1075 is an unconstitutional impairment of contract under the U.S. Constitution.** We believe that the provisions of H.B. No. 1075, if challenged in court, would fail to meet the test to determine whether a statute is constitutional under the Contracts Clause, as set out in the more recent Hawaii Supreme Court case of Applications of Herrick & Irish, 82 Haw. 329, 922 P.2d 942 (1996) and quoted by the Attorney General in its prior opinions relating to proposed laws which alter lease terms to benefit lessees:

In deciding whether a state law has violated the federal constitutional prohibition against impairment of contracts, U.S. Const., art. I, §10, cl. 1, we must assay the following three criteria: (1) whether the state law operated as a substantial impairment of a contractual relationship; (2) whether the state law was designed to promote a significant and legitimate public purpose; and (3) whether the state law was a reasonable and narrowly-drawn means of promoting the significant and legitimate public purpose.

**It is not good public policy to use legislation to alter the terms and conditions of contracts to favor one party to a contract, or to attempt to address private disputes.** The proposed H.B. 1075 is yet another attempt to infringe on a lessor's ability to enter into and negotiate a lease. Under the law, a lease is a contract between two parties entered into at their own free will; the terms and conditions of the lease are agreed to in their entirety when the lease is executed; the lessee and lessor may seek amendments or modifications to the lease terms and conditions as long as both parties agree; and if there is a dispute, either party may seek resolution through the courts.

**Conclusion.** The intent and application of H.B. No. 1075 is both unconstitutional and also is profoundly anti-business and bad public policy, and therefore the bill should be held.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our opposition to H.B. 1075.

## LATE TESTIMONY

wakai1-Karen

---

**From:** yamashita1-lan  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2008 9:00 AM  
**To:** wakai1-Karen  
**Subject:** FW: Testimony for HB 1075

---

**From:** Alohasstates1@aol.com [mailto:Alohasstates1@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 25, 2008 4:58 PM  
**To:** Rep. Kyle Yamashita; Rep. Glenn Wakai; Rep. Lyla B. Berg; Rep. Tom Brower; Rep. Jerry Chang; Rep. Corinne Ching; Rep. Faye Hanohano; Rep. Robert Herkes; Rep. Joey Manahan; Rep. Barbara Marumoto; Rep. Clifton K. Tsuji; Rep. Ryan Yamane  
**Cc:** Alohasstates1@aol.com  
**Subject:** Re: Testimony for HB 1075

February 25, 2008

Dear Chair, Kyle Yamashita, and members of the Economic Development & Business Concerns committee,

Please pass HB 1075.

This bill will help correct several of the major issues that have evolved over the past decades, relating to commercial and industrial long term ground leases.

It is unfortunate that land issues have been and continue to be a major component to Hawaii's high cost of living, as well as Hawaii's high cost of doing business.

By passing this bill, the Hawaii legislators will be doing their part in helping address this important matter.

Please note that there appears to be an error in the wording of the bill at Section 2, subsection (b)(3). The bill currently states: "That subject to a lease with an unexpired term of twenty years or more". This wording should be: "That subject to a ground lease with an original term of twenty years or more".

Please promptly pass HB 1075, with the above referenced correction.

Thank you.

Rick Krystoff  
Email: [alohastates1@aol.com](mailto:alohastates1@aol.com)

---

Delicious ideas to please the pickiest eaters. [Watch the video on AOL Living.](#)

2/26/2008

## LATE TESTIMONY

wakai1-Karen

---

**From:** yamashita1-lan  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2008 8:59 AM  
**To:** wakai1-Karen  
**Subject:** FW: HB 1075

---

**From:** stansolo@aol.com [mailto:stansolo@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 25, 2008 10:01 PM  
**To:** Rep. Kyle Yamashita; Rep. Glenn Wakai; Rep. Lyla B. Berg; Rep. Tom Brower; Rep. Jerry Chang; Rep. Corinne Ching; Rep. Faye Hanohano; Rep. Robert Herkes; Rep. Joey Manahan; Rep. Barbara Marumoto; Rep. Clifton K. Tsuji; Rep. Ryan Yamane  
**Subject:** Re: HB 1075

Attn: House committee on Economic Development and Business Concerns (EDB)  
Chair: Rep. Kyle T. Yamashita  
Vice Chair: Glenn Wakai  
Committee Members

Dear Chair, Kyle Yamashita and members of the Economic Development and Business Concerns Committee:

Please pass HB 1075.

I wholeheartedly support HB 1075. In my opinion, this bill will help the Hawaii economy and all the people of Hawaii. This bill will help to keep the cost of living in Hawaii more manageable.

However, there is one item in the bill that needs to be corrected:

The sentence, "Section 2 (b) (3) That subject to a lease with an unexpired term of twenty years or more."

should read, ""Section 2 (b) (3) That subject to a lease with an original ground lease term of twenty years or more."

Stan Solomon  
Stanley B. Solomon  
Snyder Family Trust / STI Industries  
Mobile phone: 310-488-2228  
E-mail: stansolo@aol.com

---

More new features than ever. Check out the new AOL Mail!