

MAR 13 2013

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

REQUESTING THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON SCHOOL OF LAW TO PROVIDE AN UPDATED STUDY TO THE LEGISLATURE ON ANY OF THE ISSUES RELATED TO PUBLIC CONCERN OR CONTENTIOUSNESS OVER THE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS AND POTENTIAL RAMIFICATIONS SURROUNDING THE USE OF AVAILABLE LANDS, PUBLIC LANDS, AND CEDED LANDS.

1 WHEREAS, our democratic system of government is founded
2 upon the belief that a system of checks and balances is
3 necessary to prevent the usurpation of power by any one of the
4 three branches of government from the others; and

5
6 WHEREAS, the doctrine of separation of powers is that a
7 government functions best when its powers are not concentrated
8 in a single authority but divided among different branches; and

9
10 WHEREAS, under the separation of powers doctrine, laws are
11 created and passed by the Legislature, which are enforced and
12 implemented by the Executive and interpreted by the Judiciary;
13 and

14
15 WHEREAS, the doctrine of separation of powers is one of the
16 fundamental cornerstones in our governmental structure, a
17 doctrine that encapsulates the ideals of a democratic
18 government, a doctrine heavily influenced by those that have
19 experienced a tyrannical government where the power to make,
20 enforce, and interpret law lay in the hands of one or only a few
21 individuals; and

22
23 WHEREAS, James Madison stated, "The accumulation of all
24 powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same
25 hands, whether of one, a few, or many, ... may justly be
26 pronounced the very definition of tyranny ... [T]he preservation
27 of liberty requires that the three great departments of power
28 should be separate and distinct"; and



1 WHEREAS, the original framers of the United States
2 Constitution found it imperative to distinguish the roles of
3 each branch of government and to expressly delegate certain
4 powers and responsibilities to each branch, which ensures that
5 no central authority will ever become too powerful to endanger
6 the liberties of the people; and

7
8 WHEREAS, as James Madison stated, "Power belonging to one
9 of the departments ought not be directly and completely
10 administered by either of the other departments. It is equally
11 evident, that none of them ought to possess, directly or
12 indirectly, an overruling influence over the others, in the
13 administration of their respective powers. It will not be
14 denied, that power is of an encroaching nature, and that it
15 ought to be effectually restrained from passing the limits
16 assigned to it"; and

17
18 WHEREAS, the Hawaii State Constitution provides in article
19 III, section 1, "The legislative power of the State shall be
20 vested in a legislature ... Such power shall extend to all
21 rightful subjects of legislation"; and

22
23 WHEREAS, article XI, section 2, of the Hawaii State
24 Constitution states, "The legislature shall vest in one or more
25 executive boards or commissions powers for the management of
26 natural resources owned or controlled by the State"; and

27
28 WHEREAS, it is the responsibility or the kuleana of the
29 Legislature to enact the laws that govern the State of Hawaii
30 that includes laws defining the appropriate use of the State's
31 land and natural resources, while ensuring that these resources
32 are maintained for the benefit of the people of Hawaii; however,
33 this task is often frustrated by executive agencies in their
34 administrative rules and by the judiciary in its interpretation
35 of statutes and constitutional provisions; and

36
37 WHEREAS, although judicial legislation is not unique to
38 Hawaii, it has become increasingly prevalent in the Hawaii
39 Supreme Court's opinions concerning land use and water law; and

40
41 WHEREAS, there is a noticeable trend in Hawaii Supreme
42 Court opinions to regularly vacate the decisions of our
43 commissions and agencies on grounds based apparently on nothing
44 more than the Court's beliefs and policies that lack sufficient



1 foundation in legal precedent, which is judicial activism that
2 creates uncertainty among the public and among the commissions
3 and agencies tasked with implementing the laws; and
4

5 WHEREAS, the Court's creation of new laws and policies
6 through judicial law making encroaches upon the powers and
7 responsibilities of the Legislature to make laws; and
8

9 WHEREAS, judicial law making is an egregious over stepping
10 when constitutional provisions and statutes exist that are
11 intended to apply to the facts of the case before the court, in
12 which case the courts should not be making new law but instead
13 should be limited to determining whether or not the applicable
14 statute applies to the particular case before the court; and
15

16 WHEREAS, in the Waiahole Ditch case (*In the Matter of the*
17 *WATER USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS*, 94 Haw. 97 (2000)) involving a
18 contested case hearing before the Water Resource Management
19 Commission, the Commission entered an order apportioning water
20 for various agricultural, nonagricultural, and leeward off
21 stream uses; and
22

23 WHEREAS, in affirming the Waiahole Ditch decision of the
24 Water Resource Management Commission, the Hawaii Supreme Court's
25 opinion rested on an antiquated and obsolete doctrine of public
26 trust, which had not been mentioned by previous court rulings in
27 water law cases since the 1800's, including that the "public
28 trust doctrine" is a fundamental principle of constitutional law
29 in Hawaii and that the framers of the constitution intended to
30 adopt the doctrine through article XI, section 1 (conservation
31 and development of resources), of the Hawaii State Constitution;
32 and
33

34 WHEREAS, the Court then proceeded to expand the scope of
35 the doctrine to include all water resources, unlimited by any
36 surface or ground distinction, under a broad interpretation of
37 "all public natural resources" as stated in article XI, section
38 1, of the Hawaii State Constitution; and
39

40 WHEREAS, the Waiahole Ditch decision did not follow the
41 long line of previously decided water dispute cases but took on
42 a separate path by using the public trust doctrine on water
43 resources; the Court had no authority to create a new law as it
44 relates to the scope of the public trust doctrine; and



1
2 WHEREAS, another more recent example is the "rail decision"
3 in Kaleikini v. Yoshioka (August 24, 2012), in which the Hawaii
4 Supreme Court interpreted the provisions of chapter 6E, Hawaii
5 Revised Statutes, to add a new requirement that archaeological
6 inventory surveys must be complete as to all phases of a project
7 before a project may begin; in this case, the City and County of
8 Honolulu and State argued that the project's programmatic
9 agreement provided that as long as an archaeological survey was
10 prepared for a particular phase, construction could begin on
11 that part of the project although surveys were not prepared for
12 the other phases; and

13
14 WHEREAS, in the Kaleikini case, the Court acknowledged the
15 absence of an express phasing provision but reasoned that the
16 review process for the entire project area must be completed
17 prior to the State Historic Preservation Division giving its
18 concurrence in the project; in doing so, the Court created a new
19 rule of practice and procedure for the agency, which intrudes
20 upon the agency's authority and discretion; and

21
22 WHEREAS, in Ka Pa'akai o Ka 'Aina v. Land Use Commission,
23 decided in 2000, the Court created an analytical framework for
24 state agencies to follow when making decisions that affect
25 native Hawaiian rights, specifying three areas that need to be
26 addressed by state agencies when making such decisions; and

27
28 WHEREAS, the Ka Pa'akai o Ka 'Aina decision mandated that
29 agencies must state: (1) definitive findings regarding the
30 extent of native Hawaiian practices, (2) definitive findings
31 about the practices undertaken outside of the area of concern or
32 the subject of the permit, and (3) specific findings or
33 conclusions regarding the effects on the impairment of any water
34 uses under article XII, section 7, of the Hawaii State
35 Constitution, relating to traditional and customary rights; and

36
37 WHEREAS, by mandating that the agencies make these specific
38 findings, the Court interfered judicially in the role of the
39 Commission by replacing the discretion of the Commission with
40 its own views of what the public interest should be and which
41 considerations must be given more weight than others; and

42



1 WHEREAS, twelve years after establishing its own policy in
2 the Ka Pa'akai o Ka 'Aina decision, the Hawaii Supreme Court
3 relied upon that policy as establishing precedent when it
4 overruled the Water Resource Management Commission in *In re 'Iao*
5 *Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit*
6 *Applications* (August 16, 2012), holding that although the
7 Commission was thorough in several respects, because it failed
8 to issue specific findings or conclusions in accordance with the
9 rule established in Ka Pa'akai o Ka 'Aina, its decision and order
10 must be vacated; and

11
12 WHEREAS, judicial legislation affects not only the
13 immediate parties to a proceeding, but also creates
14 unpredictability for the public and private sectors and
15 hamstrings commissions and agencies by the new policies and
16 procedures created by the Judiciary; and

17
18 WHEREAS, the Legislature should not continue to abdicate to
19 the Judicial branch unpredictable and unwarranted judicial
20 interpretations that contradict legislative intent, thereby
21 shifting the balance of powers to the Judiciary; and

22
23 WHEREAS, the Legislature must create the laws and policies
24 that shape and help determine the use of lands and resources
25 entrusted to the people of Hawaii; and

26
27 WHEREAS, an updated study on public lands is necessary; and

28
29 WHEREAS, the University of Hawaii William S. Richardson
30 School of Law has the knowledge, expertise, and resources to
31 gain a firm grasp of the public concern and contentiousness over
32 public lands and to study potential ramifications to public
33 lands and potential ramifications surrounding the use of
34 available lands, public lands, and ceded lands; now, therefore,

35
36 BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate of the Twenty-seventh
37 Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2013, the
38 House of Representatives concurring, that the University of
39 Hawaii William S. Richardson School of Law is requested to
40 provide an updated study to the Legislature on any of the issues
41 related to public concern or contentiousness over the use of
42 public lands and potential ramifications surrounding the use of
43 available lands, public lands, and ceded lands; and



S.C.R. NO. 188

1 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University of Hawaii
2 William S. Richardson School of Law is requested to report its
3 findings and recommendations to the Legislature no later than
4 twenty days prior to the convening of the Regular Session of
5 2014; and

6
7 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this
8 Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the University of Hawaii
9 William S. Richardson School of Law.

10
11
12

OFFERED BY: 

