

**HB 1041**

**HD2 SD1**

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Monday, April 04, 2011 6:44 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** bernie5miranda@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/5/2011 9:15:00 AM

Testimony for WAM 4/5/2011 9:15:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: bernie miranda  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [bernie5miranda@gmail.com](mailto:bernie5miranda@gmail.com)  
Submitted on: 4/4/2011

Comments:

# L A T E

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Monday, April 04, 2011 4:51 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** yoshitomt001@hawaii.rr.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/5/2011 9:15:00 AM

Testimony for WAM 4/5/2011 9:15:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Kathleen Yoshitomi  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [yoshitomt001@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:yoshitomt001@hawaii.rr.com)  
Submitted on: 4/4/2011

Comments:

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 4:36 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** schwang1@hawaii.rr.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/5/2011 9:15:00 AM  
**Attachments:** EUTF HB 1041 proposed SD2 04-05-11 WAM.pdf

**LATE**

Testimony for WAM 4/5/2011 9:15:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Paul J. Schwind  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [schwang1@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:schwang1@hawaii.rr.com)  
Submitted on: 4/5/2011

Comments:

Committee on Ways and Means  
Senator David Y. Ige, Chair  
Senator Michelle Kidani, Vice Chair

**LATE**

DATE: Thursday, April 7, 2011  
TIME: 9:35 a.m.  
Place: Conference Room 211  
State Capitol

TESTIMONY IN **OPPOSITION** TO HB 1041, HD2, PROPOSED SD2: RELATING TO  
THE HAWAII EMPLOYER-UNION HEALTH BENEFITS TRUST FUND

My name is Susan Hagiwara and I am writing in strong opposition to HB1041, HD2, Proposed SD2. I believe that the language in this bill is flawed and will adversely affect all of the 4,900 members of the Hawaii State Teachers Association-Retired (HSTA-R).

This Act seeks to limit the contributions paid by the State and counties for the **health benefit plans** of retired employees to the AMOUNT OF THE MONTHLY MEDICARE PART B PREMIUM PAID BY PERSONS IN THE LOWEST INCOME LEVEL RECOGNIZED UNDER MEDICARE PART B.

If passed, all current teacher retirees whether Medicare eligible or not will be forced to pay the majority of our health plan benefits. This will surely add more burden to our already fixed and limited incomes.

I also support that HSTA-R believes that Proposed SD2 is a violation of the State Constitutional protection of retirement benefits because it would mean a diminishment of health benefits.

Thank you.

Susan Hagiwara  
HSTA-Retired

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2011 10:58 AM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** wongj060@hawaii.rr.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM

**LATE**

Testimony for WAM 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Justin Wong  
Organization: HSTA-Retired  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [wongj060@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:wongj060@hawaii.rr.com)  
Submitted on: 4/6/2011

Comments:

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2011 12:14 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** gossj002@hawaii.rr.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM

**LATE**

Testimony for WAM 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Jo-An Goss  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [gossj002@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:gossj002@hawaii.rr.com)  
Submitted on: 4/6/2011

Comments:

Committee on Ways and Means  
Senator David Y. Ige, Chair  
Senator Michelle Kidani, Vice Chair

**LATE**

DATE: Thursday, April 7, 2011  
TIME: 9:35 a.m.  
Place: Conference Room 211  
State Capitol

TESTIMONY IN **OPPOSITION** TO HB 1041, HD2, PROPOSED SD2: RELATING TO THE HAWAII EMPLOYER-UNION HEALTH BENEFITS TRUST FUND

I am writing in strong opposition to HB1041, HD2, Proposed SD2.

This Act seeks to limit the contributions paid by the State and counties for the **health benefit plans** of retired employees to the AMOUNT OF THE MONTHLY MEDICARE PART B PREMIUM PAID BY PERSONS IN THE LOWEST INCOME LEVEL RECOGNIZED UNDER MEDICARE PART B.

As a current teacher retiree after having served 40+ years in our State education system, I was able to retire at age 63 and thus not Medicare eligible. This bill would force me to pay the majority of the cost of my health benefit plan and place a tremendous burden on my now fixed income.

Additionally, I believe that the language in this bill is flawed and is a violation of the State Constitution that protects retirement benefits. Before retiring, I calculated my benefits to include free medical benefits covered by the State and my living expenses. This bill would "diminish" my pension benefits and therefore violate the intent of our predecessors when they framed the constitution to preserve retirement benefits for civil servants.

Thank you.

Roger K. Takabayashi  
HSTA-Retired  
Former HSTA State President

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2011 2:25 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** reillyp41@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM

Testimony for WAM 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Fairfax Reilly  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [reillyp41@yahoo.com](mailto:reillyp41@yahoo.com)  
Submitted on: 4/6/2011

Comments:

OPPOSE

Maintain effective date 2050 for further review.

"Retirement benefits" are clearly "sold" as "compensation."  
Obligation of State is to review total compensation if amending any obligations. Mahalo

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2011 3:57 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** jingle@hawaii.rr.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM

Testimony for WAM 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Joanne Ing  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [jingle@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:jingle@hawaii.rr.com)  
Submitted on: 4/6/2011

Comments:

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2011 9:37 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** odetfuji4u@hawaii.rr.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM

Testimony for WAM 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Odetta Fujimori  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [odetfuji4u@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:odetfuji4u@hawaii.rr.com)  
Submitted on: 4/6/2011

Comments:  
Chair Ige and Members of the Committee:

My testimony is in opposition to H.B. 1041, proposed S.D.2 as currently drafted. It is a punitive bill that seeks to reduce the state's Medicare, Part B contribution, thus diminishing the benefits of all Medicare, Part B state and county retiree participants. The law created this expense by requiring retirees to participate in Medicare Part B and now, it wants to cap the reimbursement as a means of addressing the state's current budget problems. It is unfair to place this burden on the backs of the government retirees.

Going forward, instead of this "one size fits all" law, I believe it should be amended to provide an exemption relative to participation in the state's Medicare Part B if the retiree is able to receive coverage through other means. I am a perfect example of the current "stringent" law, for while I sought an exemption to Part B when I retired in 1995. My husband's company offered Part B coverage, however the law required me to participate in the Medicare Part B plan or lose my accrued health coverage. Playing by those rules, forced my husband and I into the state's Medicare, Part B so we could qualify for my accrued health benefits. If this is an example of "meaning well, but getting nowhere," I believe the legislature needs to tweak the law to permit or exempt those who are able to receive Part B coverage by other means (i.e, through spouse coverage or employment elsewhere) to do so, without jeopardizing the rest of their accrued benefits.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my brief comments.

Odetta Fujimori,  
State Retiree

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2011 10:06 PM  
**To:** WAM Testimony  
**Cc:** odetfuji4u@hawaii.rr.com  
**Subject:** Testimony for HB1041 on 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM

Testimony for WAM 4/7/2011 9:35:00 AM HB1041

Conference room: 211  
Testifier position: oppose  
Testifier will be present: No  
Submitted by: Odetta Fujimori  
Organization: Individual  
Address:  
Phone:  
E-mail: [odetfuji4u@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:odetfuji4u@hawaii.rr.com)  
Submitted on: 4/6/2011

Comments:  
Chair Ige and Members of the Committee:

My testimony is in opposition to H.B. 1041, proposed S.D.2 as currently drafted. It is a punitive bill that seeks to reduce the state's Medicare, Part B contribution, thus diminishing the benefits of all Medicare, Part B state and county retiree participants. The law created this expense by requiring retirees to participate in Medicare Part B and now, it wants to cap the reimbursement as a means of addressing the state's current budget problems. It is unfair to place this burden on the backs of the government retirees.

Going forward, instead of this "one size fits all" law, I believe it should be amended to provide an exemption relative to participation in the state's Medicare Part B if the retiree is able to receive coverage through other means. I am a perfect example of the current "stringent" law, for while I sought an exemption to Part B when I retired in 1995...my husband's company offered Part B coverage; the law required me to participate in the Medicare Part B plan or lose my accrued health coverage. Playing by those rules, forced my husband and I into the state's Medicare, Part B so we could qualify for my accrued health benefits. If this is an example of "meaning well, but getting nowhere," I believe the legislature needs to tweak the law to permit or exempt those who are able to receive Part B coverage by other means (i.e, through spouse coverage or employment elsewhere) to do so, without jeopardizing the rest of their accrued benefits.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my brief comments.

Odetta Fujimori,  
State Retiree  
(edited and re-submitted)