


HB 1040, HD 1



TESTIMONY OF THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE, 2009

ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:

H.B. No. 1040, H.D. 1, RELATING TO TORT LIABILITY.

BEFORE THE:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION, INTERNATIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

DATE: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 **TIME:** 1:45 P.M.

LOCATION: State Capitol, Room 224

TESTIFIER(S): Mark J. Bennett, Attorney General
or Caron Inagaki, Deputy Attorney General

Chair English and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General strongly supports this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to make permanent the liability protections in lifeguard cases and liability protections for warning signs for outdoor recreation on public lands. At present, the liability protections provided in Act 170, Session Laws of Hawaii (SLH) 2002, and Act 82, SLH 2003, will sunset on June 30, 2010.

The limited liability protection provided in Act 170 was necessary because some counties would not provide lifeguard services at state beach parks, due to fear of potential liability that might ensue. Thus, Act 170 created a climate in which lifeguard services could be provided by the counties with less fear of liability.

Under Act 152, SLH 2007, the Legislature found that the limitations on state and county liability have proven to be beneficial to the state and county governments, as well as the public. The liability protections of Act 170, as well as Act 82, SLH 2003, and Act 190, SLH 1996, as amended, have reduced the exposure of the state and county governments to substantial damages and, as a result, have allowed the state and county governments to keep recreational areas and public beach parks with potentially dangerous natural conditions open

to the public. The Legislature further found that state and county compliance with the statutorily required public warning of dangerous conditions at recreational areas and public beach parks have contributed to an improvement in public safety in these areas, which justified making the current liability exemptions for state and county governments relating to recreational areas (Act 82) and public beach parks (Act 190) and actions of county lifeguards (Act 170) permanent or extending their protections. Act 190 was made permanent in 2007 and the liability protections in Acts 170 and 82 were extended to June 30, 2010.

Act 152 established a task force to examine the effectiveness of, collect data, and provide information to the legislature on, Acts 170, 190, and 82. The report submitted by the task force to the 2009 Legislature found nearly unanimously that Act 170 was effective and promotes and increases public safety. (The report is attached to this testimony.) The task force nearly unanimously recommended that Act 170 be made permanent. The lone dissenter was the representative of Consumer Lawyers of Hawaii, who believed that lifeguards had not been on the beaches, specifically on Kauai, long enough to determine the efficacy of Act 170.

Following the enactment of Act 170, there have been a total of 131 lifeguard rescues on Oahu's previously unguarded beaches. Since July 1, 2008, when lifeguard services commenced at Kee Beach on Kauai, county lifeguards performed 48 rescues. At Hapuna Beach Park, the only state beach park on the island of Hawaii, approximately 267 individuals were rescued during the fiscal years of 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. This is a life-saving measure that deserves to be made permanent.

Act 82 established a system of warning signs to increase public safety and protect the State and the counties from unlimited liability arising out of recreational activities on public lands. Many of these lands are inherently dangerous and contain potential risks. Act 82 created a process in which a risk assessment group reviews both the design and placement of a proposed warning sign. If the risk

assessment group approves the sign and placement, the group will then recommend it to the Chairperson of the Board of Land and Natural Resources. Public hearings are conducted and comments are received from the public throughout the process. If the Chairperson approves the design and placement of the sign, the approval will have the legal effect of providing liability protection to the State or the county after the sign is posted. These rigorous requirements must be met in order for the government entities to be afforded protection from liability.

There is now a consistent process for natural hazard evaluation and appurtenant sign designs. Administrative rules have been put in place to eliminate the ambiguity about the design and placement of warning signs and state and county governments have institutionalized this process.


As with Act 170, the Act 152 task force found nearly unanimously that the program established pursuant to Act 82 is effective and promotes and increases public safety, and recommended that Act 82 be made permanent. The lone dissenter was, again, the representative of Consumer Lawyers of Hawaii, who wanted this Act considered in the 2010 legislative session.

The process established by Act 82 has allowed the State and the counties to refine its signage and improve the quality of its warning signs on public lands throughout the State, benefiting public users and at the same time providing the State and the counties with conditional protection from liability for the inherent risks that exist on public lands.

Acts 170 and 82 should be made permanent.

We therefore respectfully request that this bill be passed.

State of Hawaii
Department of the Attorney General



**Report of the Task Force Established by
Act 152, Session Laws of Hawaii 2007**

*Submitted to
The Twenty-Fifth State Legislature
Regular Session of 2009*

This report has been prepared for submission to the Twenty-Fifth Legislature, Regular Session of 2009, pursuant to Act 152, Session Laws of Hawaii (SLH) 2007, twenty days prior to the convening of the 2009 regular session.

I. BACKGROUND

Under Act 152 the Legislature found that that the limitations on state and county liability have proven to be beneficial to the state and county governments, as well as the public. The liability protections have reduced the exposure of the state and county governments to substantial damages and, as a result, have allowed the state and county governments to keep recreational areas and public beach parks with potentially dangerous natural conditions open to the public. The Legislature also found that state and county compliance with the statutorily required public warning of dangerous natural conditions at recreational areas and public beach parks has contributed to an improvement in public safety in these areas, which justifies making the current liability exemptions for state and county governments relating to recreational areas and public beach parks and actions of county lifeguards permanent or extending their protections.

Accordingly:

Act 152, SLH 2007, amended Act 82, SLH 2003, by extending its mandate through June 30, 2010.

Act 152, SLH 2007, amended Act 170, SLH 2002, by extending its mandate through June 30, 2010.

Act 152, SLH 2007, amended Act 190, SLH 1996, as amended by Act 101, SLH 1999, as amended by Act 170, SLH 2002, by making Act 190 permanent.

II. ACT 152 TASK FORCE CREATION

The Act 152 Task Force was convened after participants were solicited via their respective county mayors and formally appointed pursuant to Act 152. Other Task Force members were seated because of their knowledge and expertise in the subject areas covered by Acts 82, 170, and 190.

The Task Force members are:

- (1) Caron M. Inagaki (Task Force Chairperson), Deputy Attorney General, as designee of the Attorney General;
- (2) Jay Furfaro, designee of the President of the Hawaii State Association of Counties;
- (3) Ralph Goto, Director, Ocean Safety & Lifeguard Services Division, Department of Emergency Services, designee of the

Mayor of the City and County of Honolulu;

(4) Tamara Horcajo, designee of the Mayor of the County of Maui
(Act 82);

(5) Marian Feenstra, designee of the Mayor of the County of Maui
(Acts 170/190)

(6) Clint Coloma, designee of the Mayor of the County of Hawaii;

(7) Kalani Vierra, designee of the Mayor of the County of Kauai
(Acts 170/190)

(8) Lani Nakazawa, designee of the Mayor of the County of Kauai
(Act 82)

(9) Robert S. Toyofuku, designee of Executive Director of the
Consumer Lawyers of Hawaii

Also participating in the Task Force were:

Dan S. Quinn, Department of Land and Natural Resources (Acts
82/170/190)

Curt Cottrell, Department of Land and Natural Resources (Act 82)

William V. Brillhante, Deputy Corporation Counsel, County of
Hawaii

Randolph R. Slaton, Deputy Attorney General (Acts 170/190)

Dawn Spurlin, Deputy Corporation Counsel, City and County of
Honolulu

Jeffrey Ueoka, Deputy Corporation Counsel, County of Maui

Mary Kielty, County of Maui

III. SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES

The purpose of the Task Force is to advise the Legislature of the effectiveness of, collect sufficient data relating to, and provide to the Legislature information on Act 82, SLH 2003; Act 170, SLH 2002; and Act 190, SLH 1996, as amended. In this regard, the Act required the State and the counties to:

(1) Collect data on and examine the effectiveness of providing lifeguards conditional liability protection for lifeguard services at

state beach parks, except for gross negligence and wanton acts or omissions;

(2) Collect data on and examine the effectiveness and adequacy of warning signs at public beach parks in increasing public safety, reducing ocean-related accidents, and protecting the State and the counties from unlimited liability with regard to activities in the ocean and at public beaches; and

(3) Collect data on and examine the effectiveness and adequacy of warning signs at public recreational lands in increasing public safety, and protecting the State and the counties from unlimited liability arising out of recreational activities on public lands.

As the Task Force was not funded for any services, the members relied on available, reliable sources of data and information in an effort to review what steps already have been undertaken to implement the Acts under study; to gauge whether the steps seem to have been successful or undertaken in an appropriate process to provide greater safety for the public; and to obtain the opinions of the members of the Task Force with specific expertise about what additional steps, if any, could or should be undertaken in the future subject to the approval of and funding by the Legislature.

Specific steps undertaken in implementing Acts 82, 170, and 190 are contained in the reports that have been submitted to the Legislature in regard to each of those acts. In regard to Act 152, the Task Force made the following determinations.

A. Act 82

The members reviewed sources of data and their interpretation regarding the effectiveness and adequacy of warning signs at public recreational lands in increasing public safety, and protecting the State and the counties from unlimited liability arising out of recreational activities on public lands. Act 82 provides for a system of warning signs to increase public safety, in turn, protecting the State and the counties from unlimited liability arising out of recreational activities on public lands, in particular, trails. The general consensus was that the warning signs aid the recreational user in exercising caution, and that a reasonable recreational user will inquire further about conditions of the trails if not certain about the conditions or the user's own familiarity with the trails or skills that might be involved in using the trails. As the Legislature is aware, the design of various signs and their placement have been the ongoing responsibility of another task force, the Risk Assessment Working Group (RAWG), to which reference is made for specifics of the program.

Using the current American National Standards Institute (ANSI) guidelines, RAWG designed safety signs to address the following priority natural hazards: flash floods, falling rocks, hazardous cliffs, submerged hazards as well as ancillary uniform management signs (end of trail, end of road, area closed). In 2004, public input was solicited through statewide public informational meetings. Specific aspects related to sign design were revised as a result of comments received from the public.

That same year, as mandated by Act 82, SLH 2003, the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) completed the first draft of the proposed chapter 13-8 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) for the Design and Placement of Warning Signs on Improved Public Lands.

In February of 2005, the Board of Land and Natural Resources (Board) approved the draft chapter 13-8, HAR, and the release of the draft document for public hearings. In May 2005, Governor Lingle approved the proposed chapter 13-8 for public hearing. A public hearing was conducted on August 23, 2005. Oral and written comments were received from the public and minor revisions were proposed. No substantive changes were requested.

On November 18, 2005, the Board approved the staff's revision based upon public hearing comments and recommended approval of the proposed chapter 13-8, HAR, to the Governor. On January 6, 2006, the Department of the Attorney General approved the draft chapter 13-8 as to form. On January 23, 2006, the Governor approved the proposed chapter 13-8, HAR, and the finalized rule was filed on February 4, 2006. There is now a consistent process for natural hazard evaluation and appurtenant sign designs. The administrative rules have eliminated the ambiguity about the design and placement of warning signs and state and county governments have institutionalized this process.

In 2007, the Board approved placement of signs at Manoa Falls Trail on Oahu, Kealakekua State Historical Park on the island of Hawaii, Makena Beach State Park on Maui, and at Diamond Head and Kuilei Cliffs County Beach Parks on Oahu.

In 2008, the Board approved warning signs for the Kauai County Bicycle Path and a variety of Division and Forestry Wildlife and Na Ala Hele Trails on the islands of Kauai (22), Maui (18) and Hawaii (11), for a total of 51 signs. Also in 2008, the Board approved various locations at Kalalau Beach and Opaekaa Falls on Kauai and Diamond Head, Pali Lookout, and Sacred Falls on Oahu.

A prime example of the efficacy of, and the necessity for, Act 82 is the wildfire that burned approximately 2,300 acres of public forest within Kula and Kahikinui Forest Reserves on Maui in 2007. This fire event resulted in scores of hazard trees having to be removed from along the access roads and trails, but thousand of mature trees, although damaged, were still left standing. This posed a potential hazard for any users who deviated from the access roads and trails. This hazardous situation would potentially require many years of constant mitigation for a vast area and a countless and unknown number of damaged trees. Both Kula and Kahikinui Forest Reserves contain Na Ala Hele trails, while Polipoli State Park lies completely within the boundaries of Kula Forest Reserve. To deal with this potential hazard, pursuant to Act 82, new warning signs were proposed, intended to warn of dangerous natural conditions related to hazard trees to members of the public who use these roads and trails to access these areas, and for public hunters who retrieve game from the interiors of the forest reserves. Following the solicitation of public comment, on May 23, 2008, the Board approved the design and placement of 23 new site specific hazard tree signs in the Kula and Kahikinui Forest Reserves. Without Act 82, the State would be faced with a long-term immitigable hazard with no viable means to protect the safety of public users within the Reserves.

The processes established by RAWG to create and place warning signs to warn of potential hazards has had an effect beyond just the previously identified natural hazards (flash floods, falling rocks, hazardous cliffs, submerged hazards). Earlier this year, the Department of Health (DOH) sought RAWG's assistance in creating a warning sign based on design guidelines developed by RAWG to revise the DOH's existing Leptospirosis signs. Leptospirosis is a clear bacteriological threat that can cause gastrointestinal problems, fever, and, in some severe cases, death. The existing warning signs contained a long narrative in English that would be ineffective for any non-English speakers. Following the Act 82 guidelines, a sign was designed with pictographs warning of the exposure and the potential consequences of exposure. Thus, without Act 82, this threat to the public's health and safety would not be effectively disseminated and understood by the maximum number of people.

The members of this Task Force considered that the program, as being administered, is effective and promotes and increases public safety. Additional steps that could be undertaken include further education efforts, both for residents as well as visitors, similar to that outlined in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 166, offered on March 13, 2008, requesting the assistance of the Hawaii Tourism Authority and the Department of Health in providing safety information to visitors regarding potential hazards on hiking trails and other recreational areas. The counties, Kauai in particular, are looking for ways to address the problem with guidebooks, not sanctioned by the State, that may not contain sufficient information that fully or adequately warns tourists, or recreational users unfamiliar with the area, of existing dangers.

B. Act 170

The members reviewed sources of data and their interpretation regarding the effectiveness of providing conditional liability protection for lifeguard services at state beach parks while providing rescue, resuscitative, or other lifeguard services. As the Legislature is aware, the function of Act 170 has been the ongoing responsibility of another task force, to which reference is made for specifics of the program.

The primary data that the members reviewed for studies of drownings in Hawaii were prepared by Daniel J. Galanis, Ph.D., the state epidemiologist with the Department of Health, Injury and Prevention Control Program. Methods of estimating attendance at guarded beaches include estimated attendance from lifeguards (a method limited due to the fact that not all beaches are guarded, though new technology now provides the capacity for Oahu to undertake counts), and population figures. Lifeguards on Oahu, for example, maintain extensive logs for their stations, including data for attendance, contacts with the public, preventive actions, first aid, rescues, and drownings. These data could provide a valuable source for further study pending funding. There were some 700 drownings in Hawaii from 1993 through 2004, almost equally divided among residents and visitors, except for the period 2002-2004, when non-resident drownings exceeded resident drownings by almost fifty percent. During the period 2003-2007, an average of 67 drownings occurred annually. Not surprisingly, Dr. Galanis noted that some 81 percent of the victims drowned in the ocean.

While Dr. Galanis determined that there were no consistent trends in the annual number

of ocean drownings, whether considering all victims or stratifying by residence status, in absolute numbers, the drownings involving non-residents tended to go up and down, while the drownings involving residents trended downward, from 2.7 drownings per 100,000 population in 1993 to 1.8 drownings per 100,000 population in 2004. While statistical analysis might not consider the figures to be statistically significant, the lower numbers mean that people are not drowning and families are not suffering the loss or injury of loved ones. During the period 2003-2007, at least 713 “near-drownings” occurred, almost two-thirds involving non-residents.

The members of the Task Force, with the exception of the Consumer Lawyers of Hawaii (CLH), considered that the program, as being administered, is effective, and promotes and increases public safety. It cannot be disputed that a guarded beach is safer than an unguarded beach. Every rescue on a guarded beach is a life saved. Following the enactment of Act 170, there have been a total of 132 lifeguard rescues on Oahu's previous unguarded beaches, Keawaula Beach and Kaena Point State Park. In 2007-2008 alone, Kauai's water safety officers has saved an estimated 312 lives through 234 water rescues, 37 jet ski rescues and 41 assists. The concerns previously expressed by CLH in their legislative testimony have been addressed now that certain beaches on Maui and Kauai that were identified by CLH as being unguarded (Makena and Kee Beach) are now guarded or will soon be guarded. At Hapuna Beach State Park, the Big Island's only state beach park, approximately 267 individuals were rescued during the fiscal years of 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. (There were 549 rescues at the Big Island county beaches during that same time period.) Contrary to CLH's belief, the State of Hawaii has entered into contracts with the County of Maui and the County of Kauai for lifeguard services at previously unguarded state beach parks.

Additional steps that could be undertaken include further education efforts, both for residents as well as visitors, such as that outlined in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 166, offered on March 13, 2008, requesting the assistance of the Hawaii Tourism Authority and the Department of Health in providing water safety information to visitors. As with recreational use lands, efforts are being made to address the problem of non-State-sanctioned guidebooks that may not contain information sufficient to warn visitors of risks associated with ocean conditions at particular beaches. While Act 170 provides the capacity for the State to contract with all counties for lifeguard services for state park beaches, funding remains a challenge and a limit on the overall effectiveness of the program.

While the majority of the members consider that the program works well currently, the members recognize that the difficulty of providing additional funding continues to place a limit on the program. In addition, Act 170 has been estimated to have saved the State approximately \$1,000,000 in liability insurance costs over the course of the first four contract periods since Act 170 became effective.

C. Act 190

Act 190 provides meaningful warning to the general public of extremely dangerous natural conditions in ocean areas adjacent to public parks, and establishes legally adequate and defensible standards for those warnings. While the standardization of ocean hazard signs at public beach parks affords greater liability protection, it is even more valuable from the resident

or visitor beachgoer perspective, as the signs are meaningful, consistent, more and more recognizable, and, therefore, result in promoting greater understanding, respect, and enjoyment of the ocean environment. Signs developed through the Act 190 process have been used by other agencies throughout the country and are being considered for adoption by at least one international organization. In addition, the format of the Act 190 signs was used by RAWG as a template for signs to warn people of natural hazards under Act 82.

As the Legislature is aware, the design of various signs and their placement has been the ongoing responsibility of another task force, to which reference is made for specifics of the program. As Dr. Galanis noted earlier, many factors are involved in drownings and these factors “vary between individual drownings”; in addition, data “are of unknown quality or completely lacking.” The general consensus was that the warning signs aid the recreational user in exercising caution, and that a reasonable recreational user will inquire further about conditions of the ocean if not certain about the conditions or the user’s own familiarity with the ocean or skills that might be involved in enjoying the ocean. Warning sign work has been undertaken pursuant to Act 190 at beach parks statewide, including more recent signage on Kauai and the Big Island at Anahola, Kahaluu, Lehia, and Laaloa Beach Parks.

All members of the Task Force, except CLH, consider that the program, as being administered, is effective, and promotes and increases public safety. Additional steps that could be undertaken include further education efforts, both for residents as well as visitors, similar to that outlined in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 166, offered on March 13, 2008, requesting the assistance of the Hawaii Tourism Authority and the Department of Health in providing water safety information to visitors. Hawaiian Airlines began a voluntary program earlier. A significant step forward in this process is providing information so that people can make educated, responsible decisions—the best example of this is the Hawaii Beach Safety website (<http://oceansafety.soest.hawaii.edu>), a project spearheaded earlier by member Ralph Goto, through the University of Hawaii. The site is easily accessible from anywhere, and can be used by those in the visitor industry, particularly hotel and lodging employees who are asked questions or for advice or directions by visitors. In addition, other efforts have been made to inform the general public of beach safety issues, such as the web site for Kauai, http://www.kauaiexplorer.com/guides/beach/beach_safety.php. A key factor is that education needs to focus on helping individuals increase their understanding of and respect for the various factors involved in using Hawaii’s natural resources, rather than creating a sense of fear.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The CLH has taken a dissenting position from the rest of the Task Force members. The CLH's position is stated below. The remainder of the Task Force members does not necessarily agree to the accuracy of, or concur with, any of the facts, representations, and statements made by CLH.

Despite the CLH's desire for additional data, the remainder of the Task Force members believes that it would not be possible to collect data to prove a negative; i.e. how many people were not injured or killed because they heeded a warning sign. Moreover, the remainder of the Task Force believes that without funding for the appropriate research, it would be difficult to

collect meaningful data of any kind to prove the effectiveness of preventive programs such as signage or guarded beaches. The CLH provides no suggestion on how such data can be obtained. The remainder of the Task Force members believes that the benefits of placing warning signs and having guarded beaches are self-evident. Aside from CLH, the Task Force members believe that the programs developed under Acts 82, 170, and 190 have been effective in increasing public safety. They strike a reasonable balance between the government's duty to warn of potentially hazardous natural conditions in the ocean and on public recreational lands, and the public's responsibility to make informed choices when accessing recreational use lands. All Task Force members, except CLH, would recommend that the 2010 sunset date on Acts 82 and 170 be repealed (as with Act 190 in 2007) and Acts 82 and 170 be codified into the Hawaii Revised Statutes as permanent law.

If Acts 82 and 170 are not made permanent during the 2009 legislative session and the Legislature determines that the Task Force should continue to gather additional data, the Task Force requests that the Legislature extend the sunset dates for Acts 82 and 170 and that sufficient funds be appropriated to allow the Task Force to perform to its optimal effectiveness.

V. DISSENTING POSITION OF THE CONSUMER LAWYERS OF HAWAII

As stated in the main body of this report, Act 170 is scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2010, and Act 82 is scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2010. CLH is opposed to having these two acts codified into the Hawaii Revised Statutes and recommends that the Legislature visit these acts during the 2010 session when sufficient data is available.

The sunset provisions in these Acts were included to give the task forces created by these Acts, as well as other parties, the opportunity to collect sufficient data to present to the Legislature so that the members could make a reasonable and informed decision as to whether the law they passed has worked and is still working in the way they intended.

These sunset dates were included with the knowledge of all of the parties concerned, including the State and the counties, for the same purpose; that is, to collect adequate data and information to determine the impact and effectiveness of this law. CLH's position has always been that before a policy decision is made on making any law permanent, the proponents of this bill should present adequate information to the Legislature on how these various laws have worked.

Regarding Act 170, the major reason for the bill proposed in 2002 was the fact that the County of Kauai did not want to place lifeguards on certain state beach parks for fear of liability. It was promised that county lifeguards would be stationed at certain state beach parks if Act 170 were passed. There has not been sufficient information presented as to when lifeguards were placed on those beaches, how many have been on guard and which beaches on Kauai, and whether a contract was entered into between the State and County of Kauai for lifeguard services. Further, there has been no reporting as to whether drownings have been reduced, especially on Kauai. Our understanding is that it was only in 2007 or 2008 that lifeguards have ever been placed on the beaches on Kauai, but the immunity from negligence applies to all lifeguards presently employed in the State. It has been over five years since Act 170 was first

passed and it has been only about a year since the intent of this was actually implemented on Kauai; that is, placing lifeguards on those dangerous beaches on Kauai. CLH is of the opinion that the Legislature needs more time to have proper data presented to it regarding the effectiveness of this law.

Act 82 passed in 2003 and is scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2010. The position of CLH is that it should not be made permanent, if at all, before that time. CLH's understanding is that the warning signs were only approved in February 2007 and were not placed until later in the year. This is almost five years after the act was passed. Similar to the comments made regarding Act 170, the same analysis applies to this law. The Legislature needs the time to review sufficient data in order to consider the effectiveness of the act. If the Legislature is to consider making the act permanent, it will have less than two years of information since the placement of the signs required by this act. CLH's opinion is that this act should be considered in the 2010 legislative session and not in the 2009 session.

VI. KAUAI COUNTY'S REBUTTAL TO CLH'S DISSENTING POSITION

The members of the Task Force from Kauai County submitted a rebuttal in response to CLH's position as follows.

Paragraph 4 of CLH's submittal states that "the major reason for the bill proposed in 2002 was the fact that the County of Kauai did not want to place lifeguards on certain state beach parks for fear of liability" and that "it was only in 2007 or 2008 that lifeguards have ever been placed on the beaches on Kauai, but the immunity from negligence applies to all lifeguards presently employed in the state." These statements are incorrect and misleading. The legislative history shows that Act 170 and other lifeguard immunity measures proposed by the Legislature addressed concerns regarding rising exposure to liability voiced by lifeguards in all jurisdictions, and by the State and the counties. In the conference committee report for Senate Bill No. 796, SD1 HD1 CD2 (Act 170), the legislature makes clear that immunity was granted to promote lifeguard presence on beaches throughout the State. "Testimony on this measure indicated that the prospect of large damage suits contributes to the costs of insurance and the reluctance to providing lifeguards. Your Committee on Conference believes that the lifeguards and the State or county must have immunity so that lifeguards can at least be provided on the beaches." (Conference Committee Report No. 66-02 re: SB No. 796, SD1 HD2 CD2).



CLH also states that "[i]t was promised that county lifeguards would be stationed at certain state beach parks if Act 170 were passed," and "[t]here has not been sufficient information presented as to when lifeguards were placed on those beaches, how many have been on guard and which beaches on Kauai, and whether a contract was entered into between state and county of Kauai for lifeguard services." CLH is aware that Kee Beach is the only State beach on Kauai that was identified for lifeguarding. The CLH is also aware that no State funding was provided for lifeguarding at Kee Beach until the 2007-2009 biennium. This funding was released in May 2008, and county lifeguarding services commenced at Kee Beach on July 1, 2008. Since July 1, 2008, county lifeguards at Kee Beach have performed 48 rescues and 2 assists, taken 4,989 preventive actions, and administered minor first aid in 282 instances. If lifeguards had not been present, the rescues, assists, and even some of the preventive actions

could have resulted in drownings. In addition, lifeguards at Kee Beach responded to 12,668 inquiries from 52,482 visitors to the beach. These are staggering figures for a period of less than five months, and illustrate the public safety benefits of a guarded beach.

CLH states that “there has been no reporting as to whether drownings have been reduced, especially on Kauai.” This statement is incorrect. This report documents that in 2007-2008, an estimated 312 lives on Kauai were saved by lifeguards. In addition, the Kauai Fire Department statistics quoted in the previous paragraph evidence that 48 lifeguard rescues were performed at Kee Beach. These incidents would likely have resulted in drownings without lifeguard intervention.

Finally, CLH opposes extension of Acts 170 and 82 because it believes that the Legislature needs more time to have proper data presented to it regarding the effectiveness of these Acts. Yet, the CLH Task Force member admitted at the last Task Force meeting that there was no reasonable way to collect such data. That being the case, there is no reason to delay legislative action to continue the benefits of Act 152, SLH 2007.

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



**STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

POST OFFICE BOX 621
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

**Testimony of
LAURA H. THIELEN
Chairperson**

**Before the Senate Committee on
TRANSPORTATION, INTERNATIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

**Wednesday, March 18, 2009
1:45 PM
State Capitol, Conference Room 224**

**In consideration of
HOUSE BILL 1040, House Draft 1
RELATING TO TORT LIABILITY**

House Bill 1040, House Draft 1 proposes to make permanent the law that provides the state and county governments with liability protection for public use of certain state or county recreational areas including lifeguard services at state and county beaches. While the Department of Land and Natural Resources (Department) strongly supports the substantive language in the House Draft 1 of this Administration measure as it provides a permanent exception from liability for county lifeguards while carrying out their duties and responsibilities, the Department however prefers the original version of this bill with the effective date of the Act upon its approval.

This bill amends Act 170, Session Laws of Hawaii (SLH) 2002 (Act 170), as amended by Act 152, SLH 2007 by repealing the June 30, 2010 sunset date. Act 170 provides liability immunity for counties and county lifeguards while providing rescue, resuscitative or other lifeguard services. The State does not have lifeguards and contracts with the counties for lifeguard services at its State Parks. Liability concerns had prevented counties from participating. Act 170 cleared up these concerns and allowed the State to contract with all counties for lifeguard services at State Park beaches.

This measure also amends Act 82, SLH 2003 (Act 82), by eliminating the provision that repeals the Act in 2008, thus allowing the Act to continue and be codified in Chapters 663 and 171, Hawaii Revised Statutes. Act 82 established a process that balances the responsibility of the government's duty to warn of dangerous natural conditions in specific state and county recreational areas adjacent to natural conditions, and the public's duty to heed posted signs and make an informed choice.

Act 82 was promulgated due to concern about the adequacy of warning signs for potentially dangerous natural conditions and public exposure at state and county parks and along specific Na Ala Hele trails and access roads (defined as improved public lands under Act 82). The

LAURA H. THIELEN
CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

RUSSELL Y. TSUJI
FIRST DEPUTY

KEN C. KAWAHARA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR - WATER

AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
BUREAU OF CONVEYANCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
ENGINEERING
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
KAHOOLAWE ISLAND RESERVE COMMISSION
LAND
STATE PARKS

Department contracted the United States Forest Service to conduct an evaluation of these specific state parks and trails to identify reoccurring dangerous natural conditions that could not be mitigated and that warranted signage. The four natural conditions identified are: rock fall, flashfloods, cliffs and submerged object in streams that would cause injury from impact associated with diving or jumping into the water.

Act 82 established a Risk Assessment Working Group (RAWG) that reviewed the beach safety signs, as well as the most current warning sign standards from the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). Using current ANSI guidelines, the RAWG established prototype sign design and placement guidelines. The prototype signs underwent public review and were modified according to comments. The guidelines were incorporated into Title 13, Chapter 8, Hawaii Administrative Rules for the design and placement of warning signs on improved public lands, which have been approved by the Governor. The final set of signs and their ancillary locations have been approved by the Board of Land and Natural Resources. The signs are now concluded to be adequate, thus reducing the state and county liability associated with the identified natural conditions.

For the reasons stated in this testimony, the Department strongly supports the substantive language of House Bill 1040, House Draft 1 in its objective to continue the partnership of the State and the Counties to enhance safety of public park users while promoting a greater understanding, respect, and enjoyment of the otherwise inviting ocean that we are blessed with. The sunset provisions in Act 170 and Act 82 need to be removed. In closing, the Department respectfully asks that the effective date be restored to "upon its approval".

HAWAII COUNCIL OF MAYORS

Testimony of the

Hawaii Council of Mayors

Bernard P. Carvalho, Jr., Mayor of Kauai
Mufi Hannemann, Mayor of Honolulu
Billy Kenoi, Mayor of Hawaii
Charmaine Tavares, Mayor of Maui

Before a Hearing of the
**Senate Committee on Transportation, International and
Intergovernmental Affairs**

March 18, 2009

House Bill 1040, H.D. 1, Relating to Tort Liability


The Hawaii Council of Mayors strongly supports House Bill 1040, H.D. 1, repealing the sunset dates of Act 170 (SLH 2002) and Act 82 (SLH 2003), which together provide liability coverage to government and lifeguards when providing lifeguard services and public access to our ocean and recreational areas.

We ask for your approval of this measure and further request that it be amended to become effective upon approval.


The immunities granted by the Legislature to the counties for dangerous natural conditions on public lands (Act 82) and the provision of lifeguard services (Act 170) have been very beneficial to the county governments and the public by reducing the liability exposure of the counties to substantial damages, which, as a result, has enabled the counties to keep open to the public those recreational areas and beach parks with potentially dangerous natural conditions. The counties' compliance with the posting of signs warning of dangerous natural conditions at these recreational areas has contributed to an improvement in public safety, which justifies making permanent the existing immunities.

This legislation is a priority of the Hawaii Council of Mayors and was included in our legislative package to the 2009 Legislature.

Mahalo.




Mayor Billy Kenoi
County of Hawaii
25 Aupuni Street
Hilo, Hawaii 96720



Mayor Mufi Hannemann
City and County of Honolulu
530 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813



Mayor Bernard Carvalho, Jr.
County of Kauai
444 Rice Street
Lihue, Hawaii 96766




Mayor Charmaine Tavares
County of Maui
200 South High Street, 9th Floor
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

DEPARTMENT OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

530 SOUTH KING STREET, ROOM 110 • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
TELEPHONE: (808) 768-5193 • FAX: (808) 768-5105 • INTERNET: www.honolulu.gov

MUFI HANNEMANN
MAYOR



CARRIE K.S. OKINAGA
CORPORATION COUNSEL

DONNA M. WOO
FIRST DEPUTY CORPORATION COUNSEL

March 16, 2009

The Honorable J. Kalani English, Chair
and Members of the Committee on Transportation,
International and Intergovernmental Affairs
The Senate
State Capitol
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Chair English and Members:

Subject: House Bill No. 1040, H.D. 1
Relating to Tort Liability

The City and County of Honolulu ("City") strongly supports H.B. No. 1040, H.D. 1 which seeks to make permanent the laws limiting the liability exposure of the government when providing public access to ocean and recreational areas (Act 82, SLH 2003) and lifeguards when providing lifeguard services at our public beaches (Act 170, SLH 2002).

Passage of H.B. 1040, H.D. 1 would make our beaches more accessible and safer by allowing the Counties to continue the placement of county lifeguards at State beach parks, without the threat of costly litigation for conditions or events that are outside the Counties' control. In addition, passage of H.B. 1040, H.D. 1 would allow the public continued access to our ocean and recreational areas while still providing the Counties with protection from liability arising from dangerous natural conditions in these areas.

The City requests that H.B. No. 1040, H.D. 1 be amended to become effective upon approval. In its report to the Twenty-Fifth State Legislature, Regular Session 2009, the Task Force created by Act 152, Sessions Laws of Hawaii, 2007 ("Act 152 Task Force") to advise the Legislature of the effectiveness of, and collect sufficient data relating to Act 82, Act 170, and Act 190, SLH 1996, as amended concluded that the various programs developed

The Honorable J. Kalani English, Chair
and Members of the Committee on Transportation,
International and Intergovernmental Affairs
The Senate
HB1040, HD1
March 16, 2009
Page 2

under Acts 82, 170, and 190 have been effective in increasing public safety, that the procedures contained therein have been implemented, and continue to be implemented by the State and the Counties.

Both the State and the Counties have adopted uniform signage design and installed signage compliant with the requirements of Act 82. Where funding has been appropriated, counties have stationed lifeguards at certain State beach parks. The report further discusses the benefits of posting Act 190 and Act 82 signage to the public and how lives have been saved as a result of the posting of County lifeguards at State beach parks. Based upon its review of the various County programs for the implementation of Act 82 and Act 170, the Act 152 Task Force concludes with the recommendation that the sunset dates of Act 82 and Act 170 be repealed.

The City fully supports the recommendations of the Act 152 Task Force, and requests your support in amending and passing H.B. No. 1040, H.D. 1 to make Act 82 and Act 170 permanent laws.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments on this bill.

Very truly yours,



CARRIE K. S. OKINAGA
Corporation Counsel

CKSO:ey

HONOLULU EMERGENCY SERVICES DEPARTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

3375 KOAPAKA STREET, SUITE H-450 • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96819-1869
Phone: (808) 723-7800 • Fax: (808) 833-3934



MUFI HANNEMANN
MAYOR

ELIZABETH A. CHAR, M.D.
DIRECTOR

March 16, 2009

The Honorable J. Kalani English, Chair
and Members
The Honorable Mike Gabbard, Vice Chair
and Members
Committee on Transportation, International and
Intergovernmental Affairs Committee
The Senate
Hawaii State Capitol
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Chair English, Vice Chair Gabbard, and Committee Members:

Re: HB 1040 HD 1 Relating to Tort Liability

The Honolulu Emergency Services Department, through its Ocean Safety and Lifeguard Services Division, City and County of Honolulu, provides a comprehensive program of ocean safety for the residents of and visitors to the island of Oahu, and strongly urges your support of HB 1040.

As you may be aware, the State of Hawaii, Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) contracts with the City and County of Honolulu to provide lifeguard services at Kaena Point State Park. The provision of these services has occurred since the early 1990's, and has resulted in hundreds of rescues, first aids, and other lifesaving incidents that would surely have resulted in poor outcomes had there not been lifeguards stationed there. Because the State of Hawaii does not have a lifeguard service, DLNR contracts with the counties to provide lifeguards at certain state beach parks. (Kaena Point State Park on Oahu, Ke'e Beach on Kauai, Hapuna Beach on Hawaii Island, and Makena Beach on Maui.)

Act 170, Session Laws of Hawaii 2002, provides the necessary protection from liability for lifeguards and their respective county employers while acting in their normal course of duties. Act 170 does not provide for complete immunity, as gross negligence, wanton acts or omissions are specifically excluded from the statute, however, it does provide for protection without which the counties would not be able to staff these beaches.

The Honolulu Emergency Services Department strongly supports making Act 170 permanent and urges your favorable consideration of HB 1040.


Thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Elizabeth A. Char".

Elizabeth A. Char, M.D., Director
Honolulu Emergency Services Department

William P. Kenoi
Mayor



Lincoln S.T. Ashida
Corporation Counsel

Katherine A. Garson
Assistant Corporation
Counsel

COUNTY OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

101 Aupuni Street, Suite 325 • Hilo, Hawaii 96720-4262 • (808) 961-8251 • Fax (808) 961-8622

March 16, 2009

The Honorable Senator J. Kalani English, Chair,
and Members
Committee on Transportation, International
and Intergovernmental Affairs
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Chair English and Members of the Committee:

*Re: Testimony in Support of House Bill No. 1040, HD1
Hearing: Wednesday, March 18, 2009, at 1:45 p.m.
Conference Room 224*

The County of Hawaii's Office of the Corporation Counsel and Fire Department (collectively as "County") support HB 1040, HD1, because it seeks to make permanent the liability exemptions for state and county governments providing county lifeguard services. The County has submitted similar written testimony of the bill when it was before the Honorable Representative Ken Ito, Chair, and Members of the Committee on Water, Land and Ocean Resources for a hearing held on Monday, February 9, 2009, and before the Honorable Representative Jon Riki Karamatsu, Chair, and Members of the Committee on Judiciary for a hearing held on Thursday, February 26, 2009.

The bill repeals the sunset date of Act 170, Session Laws of Hawaii 2002 ("Act 170") that shields county lifeguards from liability. Passage of the bill will provide more access to the counties' beaches and increase safety to the beachgoers by allowing the counties to place lifeguards at county and state beach parks, without the threat of costly, unnecessary and unwanted litigation arising from dangerous natural conditions in the beach parks, ocean and public recreational areas.

Act 170 protected lifeguards from liability when they provide rescue, resuscitative or other lifeguard services. Removal of the sunset date will provide public benefits that have been well documented in the findings of the Report of the Task Force Established by Act 152 ("Task Force Report"), submitted to the Twenty-Fifth State Legislature, Regular Session 2009. The Act 152 Task Force was established to advise the Legislature of the effectiveness of three acts (Act 82 (SLH 2003), Act 170 (SLH 2002)

The Honorable Senator J. Kalani English, Chair,
and Members
March 16, 2009
Page 2

and Act 190 (SLH 1996)) that were enacted to balance the interest of protecting the safety of residents and visitors at public parks and beaches, with that of the interest of providing the counties and state protection from liability arising from dangerous natural conditions or events that are outside their control. Where funding has been appropriated, counties have stationed lifeguards at certain state beach parks. The Task Force Report concluded that various programs have been effective in increasing public safety, and that both the state and counties adopted uniform signage design and installed appropriate signage. The Task Force recommended repeal of the 2010 sunset date, and codification of Act 170 as permanent law.

The County's statistics concerning the lifeguards' services on the beaches provide substantial objective basis for passage of the bill. For example, from December 2003 to December 2008, for the four (4) beaches on West Hawai'i, there were 5,423,405 beachgoers, with 3,109,598 of those beachgoers utilizing Hāpuna, which is the only state beach on the island of Hawai'i where the County provides lifeguard services. Even though Hāpuna is the most widely used beach on the island, with more than 600,000 visitors per year, there has been only two (2) drownings. In addition, at Hāpuna, 594 beachgoers were rescued, 6 were resuscitated, and 329 were provided first aid by lifeguards. In addition, lifeguards took 59,112 preventive actions for beachgoers, which could have resulted in more injuries or death. The east side beaches show the same trend of the actions of the lifeguards who save lives, give first aid, and prevent injuries and deaths.

Thank you for your consideration of our testimony.

Sincerely,



JOSEPH K. KAMELAMELA
Deputy Corporation Counsel,
Litigation Supervisor
County of Hawai'i

JKK:fc

c via email only: Kevin Dayton, Executive Assistant
Bobby Jean Leithead-Todd, Planning Director
Darryl Oliveira, Fire Chief

COUNTY COUNCIL
Bill "Kaipo" Asing, Chair
Jay Furfaro, Vice Chair
Tim Bynum
Dickie Chang
Daryl W. Kaneshiro
Lani T. Kawahara
Derek S. K. Kawakami



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK

Peter A. Nakamura, County Clerk
Ernesto G. Pasion, Deputy County Clerk

Telephone (808) 241-6371
Fax (808) 241-6349
Email: cokcouncil@kauai.gov

Council Services Division
4396 Rice Street, Room 206
Lihu'e, Kaua'i, Hawai'i 96766-1371

March 16, 2009

**TESTIMONY OF DEREK S.K. KAWAKAMI,
KAUA'I COUNTY COUNCIL**

H.B. 1040, HD 1, RELATING TO TORT LIABILITY
Senate Transportation, International & Intergovernmental Affairs Committee
March 17, 2009
1:45 p.m.
Conference Room 325

Dear Chair J. Kalani English and Members of the Senate TIA Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in strong support of H.B. No. 1040, HD 1, Relating to Tort Liability. My testimony is submitted in my capacity as an individual member of the Kaua'i County Council and the Chair of the Council's Public Safety/Energy/Intergovernmental Relations Committee. My testimony also reflects my view in my individual capacity as the Hawai'i State Association of Counties Vice-President.

H.B. No. 1040, HD 1 repeals the sunset date established by Act 170 (SLH; 2002). Act 170 provides temporary liability protection for county lifeguard services up until 2010. The repeal of the sunset date of June 30, 2010, will greatly enhance safety for beachgoers and allow the counties to station lifeguards at county and state beach parks without the threat of potential liability.

For the reasons stated above, I am in strong support of H.B. No. 1040, HD 1 and ask for your favorable support.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to submit testimony.

Sincerely,

Derek S. K. Kawakami
Kaua'i County Councilmember

LP

Bernard P. Carvalho, Jr.
Mayor



Robert F. Westerman
Fire Chief

John T. Blalock
Deputy Fire Chief

COUNTY OF KAUAI
Fire Department
Mo'ikeha Building
4444 Rice Street, Suite 295
Lihue, Kaua'i, Hawaii 96766

March 16, 2009

The Honorable Ken Ito, Chair
Committee on Water, Land and Ocean Resources
House of Representatives
State Capitol, Room 420
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Chair Ito:

Subject: H.B. 1040 Relating to Tort Liability

My name is Robert F. Westerman, Fire Chief for the Kauai County Fire Department, testifying in support of the Bill, with amendment. The Bill repeals the sunset date and makes permanent Act 170, Session Laws of Hawai'i 2002 (Act 170). Act 170 shields county lifeguards from liability.

Passage of HB No. 1040 would make our beaches more accessible and safer by allowing the counties to continue the placement of lifeguards at State beach parks, without the threat of costly litigation for conditions or events that are outside the county's control. Act 170 has provided needed protection to lifeguards from liability when they provide rescue, resuscitative, or other lifeguard services. We support removal of the sunset date, so that the public benefits of the Act can continue.

The benefits of the Act were documented in the findings of the Report of the Task Force Established by Act 152 (Task Force Report), submitted to this Legislature this session. In its report, the Act 152 Task Force concludes that the various programs developed under Acts 82, 170, and 190 have been effective in increasing public safety, that the procedures contained therein have been implemented, and continue to be implemented by the State and the counties. Where funding has been appropriated, counties have stationed lifeguards at certain state beach parks. The report further discusses the benefits of posting Act 190 and Act 82 signage to the public and how lives have been saved as a result of the posting of county lifeguards at State beach parks. Both the State and the counties have adopted uniform signage design and installed signage compliant with the requirements of Act 82. Based upon its review of the various county programs for the implementation of Act 82 and Act 170, the Act 152 Task Force concludes with the recommendation that the sunset dates of Act 82 and Act 170 be repealed. In the Task Force Report, all task force members, with the exception of the member representing the Consumer Lawyers of Hawai'i (CLH), recommend repeal of the 2010 sunset date, and codification of Act 170 as permanent law.


The Task Force, with the exception of the CLH member, also that Act 82, Session Laws of Hawai'i 2003 (Act 82) be made permanent. Act 82 protects the State and counties from unlimited liability from recreational activities on public lands, including trails. Act 82 also provides protection to the public, because the State and counties are required to implement a system of warning signs. We request that this Bill be amended to include repeal of the June 20, 2010 sunset date of Act 82, which would make the Act permanent. Alternatively, we advocate passage of House Bill No. 848, which would accomplish the same purpose, since it proposes to amend Act 152, Session Laws of Hawai'i 2007, by repealing the sunset dates of Acts 82 and 170.

We also request that this Legislature continue the funding to the County for providing lifeguards

on certain state beach parks. On Kaua'i, the funding allows the County to provide lifeguards for Kee Beach on Kaua'i, which is a State beach. Lifeguarding began at Kee Beach last year, with significant positive results. Between July 1, 2008, and November, 2008, approximately 48 beachgoers were rescued, two were assisted, and 282 provided first aid by lifeguards. In addition, lifeguards took 4,989 preventive actions, which might have resulted in injuries or deaths. The State funding provided by this Legislature prevented tragedies from occurring because of these incidents. We urge you to provide sufficient funding to continue lifeguarding at Kee Beach.

We thank the Committee for the opportunity to present testimony on this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert Westerman". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.


Robert F. Westerman
Fire Chief

RFW/crz

Council Chair
Danny A. Mateo

Vice-Chair
Michael J. Molina

Council Members
Gladys C. Baisa
Jo Anne Johnson
Sol P. Kaho'ohalahala
Bill Kauakea Medeiros
Wayne K. Nishiki
Joseph Pontanilla
Michael P. Victorino




Director of Council Services
Ken Fukuoka

COUNTY COUNCIL
COUNTY OF MAUI
200 S. HIGH STREET
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793
www.mauicounty.gov/council

March 16, 2009

TO: Honorable J. Kalani English, Chair
Senate Committee on Transportation, International, and Intergovernmental Affairs

FROM: Danny A. Mateo 
Council Chair

SUBJECT: **HEARING OF MARCH 18, 2009; TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HB 1040, HD1,
RELATING TO TORT LIABILITY**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of this important measure. The purpose of this measure is to make two laws permanent: (1) the law shielding county lifeguards from liability; and (2) the law limiting liability of the State and counties for incidents arising on improved public lands, provided that certain signage requirements are met.

The Maui County Council has not had the opportunity to take a formal position on this measure. Therefore, I am providing this testimony in my capacity as an individual member of the Maui County Council.

I support this measure for the following reasons:

1. Act 170, SLH 2002, as amended by Act 152, SLH 2007, provides for an exception to tort liability for county lifeguards providing rescue, resuscitation, or other lifeguard services on the beach or in the ocean. As noted in this measure, Act 170, as amended, has helped the counties place lifeguards at State beach parks without fear of liability, thereby making parks safer and saving lives. The liability protections afforded under Act 170, as amended, will be repealed on June 30, 2010. I wholeheartedly support the repeal of that sunset date, to make these protections permanent.
2. Act 82, SLH 2003, as amended by Act 152, SLH 2007, limits State and county liability for incidents arising from dangerous natural conditions on improved public lands, provided certain signage requirements are met. As noted by the Legislature in 2003, the law strikes an appropriate balance between the personal responsibility of individuals engaged in recreational pursuits on improved public lands, and the government's duty to protect its citizens from harm. It is time to make the conditional protections afforded by Act 82, as amended, permanent, by repealing the sunset date currently in effect.

For the foregoing reasons, I support this measure.

Council Chair
Danny A. Mateo

Vice-Chair
Michael J. Molina

Council Members
Gladys C. Baisa
Jo Anne Johnson
Sol P. Kaho'ohalahala
Bill Kauakea Medeiros
Wayne K. Nishiki
Joseph Pontanilla
Michael P. Victorino




Director of Council Services
Ken Fukuoka

COUNTY COUNCIL
COUNTY OF MAUI
200 S. HIGH STREET
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793
www.mauicounty.gov/council

March 17, 2009

TO: Honorable Senator J. Kalani English, Chair
Senate Committee on Transportation, International and Intergovernmental
Affairs

FROM: Joseph Pontanilla, Council Member 

DATE: Wednesday February 11, 2009

SUBJECT: **SUPPORT OF HB 1040, HD1, RELATING TO TORT LIABILITY**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of this measure. The purpose of the legislation is to make two laws permanent: (1) the law shielding county lifeguards from liability; and (2) the law limiting liability of the State and counties for incidents arising on improved public lands, provided that certain signage requirements are met.

I support SB 1040 HD1 for the reasons cited in testimony submitted by Maui County Council Chair Danny A. Mateo and urge you to support this measure.

09:03:17:kbm/JP: HB 1040 HD1



March 16, 2009

The Honorable J. Kalani English, Chair,
The Honorable Mike Gabbard, Vice-Chair, and Members
Committee on Transportation, International and Intergovernmental Affairs
The Senate
The Twenty Fifth Legislature
Regular Session of 2009
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Chair English, Vice-Chair Gabbard, and Members:

Re: HB 1040, HD1 Relating to Tort Liability

The Hawaiian Lifeguard Association (HLA) is the non-profit organization that represents the 400 professional ocean lifeguards in the State of Hawaii. The mission of the HLA is to promote the advancement of professional lifeguarding and to reduce drownings in the ocean surrounding our island state. The HLA attempts to accomplish this mission by supporting the efforts of Hawaii's lifeguards through fundraising and educational programs and by partnering with the government agencies in delivering the statewide Junior Lifeguard Program.

PMB271 • 758 Kapahulu Avenue, Ste A • Honolulu, Hawaii 96816 • (808) 922-3888
Facsimile (808) 922-0411 • Email: lifeguards@aloha.com

HB 1040, HD 1

Page 2


The HLA strongly supports HB 1040, HD 1, which seeks to make permanent the protection from liability provided by Act 170 (2002) and Act 82 (2003). The protection in Act 170 is necessary for individual lifeguards as well as their employing counties to be able to provide services for the State of Hawaii at Kaena Point State Park on Oahu, Hapuna Beach on Hawaii Island, Makena Beach on Maui, and Ke'e Beach on Kauai. These four beaches are popularly used by the public and would be where drownings and serious injuries occur if lifeguard services were not provided.

The United States Lifesaving Association, the national organization of professional open water lifeguard agencies, has collected data over a twenty year period that shows that the chances of drowning at a lifeguarded beach in the United States is one in 18 million. According to the State Department of Health's Injury Prevention and Control Program, drownings that occur at unguarded beaches in the State of Hawaii far outnumber those at guarded beaches by at least 10 to one.

The necessity of providing trained lifeguards at Hawaii's beaches is obvious, a "no brainer." We urge you to acknowledge this fact by moving to remove the sunset provisions from Act 170 and Act 82 to make both laws permanent.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony. I am available to answer any questions you may have. Aloha nui loa.

Sincerely,



Ralph S. Goto

For the Board of Directors



[Home](#) | [About USLA](#) | [Public Information](#) | [Guard to Guard](#) | [Certification](#) | [Events](#) | [Message Boards](#)
 Search

 **Statistics**

The United States Lifesaving Association annually polls its chapters for the number of rescues, drownings, and other statistical information reported by lifeguard agencies. This is not a comprehensive list of all statistics generated by all beach lifeguard agencies, but the statistics of most major agencies are included here.

USLA has calculated the chance that a person will drown while attending a beach protected by USLA affiliated lifeguards at 1 in 18 million (.0000055%). This is based on the last ten years of reports from USLA affiliated lifeguard agencies, comparing estimated beach attendance to the number of drownings in areas under lifeguard protection.

Below you will find a link to the most recent year's statistics, as well as the ability to search by a reporting agency, a region and a year.

If you are an Agency, wishing to add your statistics, [Click Here](#).

[View Most Recent Annual Statistics](#) | [View Past 5 Year Statistics](#)

For more detailed statistics the following options are available.

National Statistics by Year

Select a Year:

Display

Statistics for a Selected Agency

Year:

Agency:

Display

National Statistics by Region



HAWAII GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

AFSCME Local 152, AFL-CIO

RANDY PERREIRA
Executive Director
Tel: 808.543.0011
Fax: 808.528.0922

NORA A. NOMURA
Deputy Executive Director
Tel: 808.543.0003
Fax: 808.528.0922

DEREK M. MIZUNO
Deputy Executive Director
Tel: 808.543.0055
Fax: 808.523.6879

The Twenty-Fifth Legislature, State of Hawaii
Hawaii State Senate
Committee on Transportation, International and Intergovernmental Affairs

Testimony by
Hawaii Government Employees Association
March 18, 2009

H.B. 1040, H.D. 1 – RELATING TO
TORT LIABILITY

The Hawaii Government Employees Association strongly supports the purpose and intent of H.B. 1040, H.D. 1. This legislation provides state and county governments with a permanent exception from liability for the acts of county lifeguards while acting within the scope of their duties and responsibilities, except for gross negligence or wanton acts of omissions. At present, the liability protections afforded to lifeguards under Act 170, SLH 2002 will expire on June 30, 2010.

This liability protection enables lifeguard services to be provided by the counties without fear of liability. Making the lifeguard immunity permanent ensures that the maximum number of beach parks are guarded, thereby limiting the potential liability for drowning deaths and other injuries sustained at public beach parks.

The bill also makes permanent the limitation on liability of the state and counties for incidents taking place on improved public lands provided certain signage requirements are met. This type of liability protection has allowed the state and the four counties to keep recreational areas and public beach parks open to the public. Compliance by the various jurisdictions with the statutorily required public warnings of dangerous conditions at these sites has improved public safety, which justifies making the liability protections permanent.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of H.B. 1040, H.D. 1.

Respectfully submitted,

Nora A. Nomura
Deputy Executive Director

**TESTIMONY OF ROBERT TOYOFUKU ON BEHALF OF THE HAWAII
ASSOCIATION FOR JUSTICE (HAJ) formerly known as the CONSUMER
LAWYERS OF HAWAII IN OPPOSITION TO H.B. NO. 1040, HD 1**

March 18, 2009

To: Chairman J. Kalani English and Members of the Senate Committee on Transportation, International and Government Affairs:

My name is Bob Toyofuku and I am presenting this testimony on behalf of the Hawaii Association for Justice (HAJ) in opposition to H.B. No. 1040, HD 1.

The purpose of this bill is to make Act 170, Sessions Laws of Hawaii, 2002, as amended, and Act 82, Session Laws of Hawaii, 2003, as amended, permanent. Currently, Act 170 regarding the immunity from negligence for lifeguards is scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2010, and this was enacted by the legislature with the knowledge of all of the parties concerned, including the state and counties. The sunset provision in the original bill passed in 2002 was included to "allow for an evaluation of this measure after sufficient experience has been obtained." See Conference Committee Report No. 66-02 on S.B. 796, C.D.2. The sunset date was extended several times and during the 2007 legislative session, the conference committee, in a bill pertaining to several prior Acts pertaining to lifeguards, beach liability and public recreational lands, determined that it would be best to extend the sunset date to 2010 for Act 170.

Act 170 was passed in 2002 and it was not until July 1, 2008, less than one year ago, that lifeguards were placed on Ke'e Beach on Kauai, which was one of the dangerous beaches at the heart of this legislation. We feel that it is reasonable to let the sunset date of 2010 remain and that the legislature can look at the information during the 2010 session.

Please note that the 2002 legislature set the sunset date on this Act for 2007, five years after enactment, on the assumption that lifeguards would be placed on that particular beach and other beaches on Kauai by the end of that year and that there would be at least four years of experience to review. Currently, as to that dangerous beach, we have less than one year of experience.

Regarding Act 82 which was passed due in large part to the deaths and injuries that occurred by the rock slide at Sacred Falls in 1999 and the ensuing civil trial in 2001 on behalf of those killed and injured. Like in Act 170, the legislature in 2003 included a sunset date of 2008, five years after passage, in order to determine how the intent of the law was working and to provide the legislature with adequate information. It was four years later when the first warning signs were approved and placed (2007) and five years later (2008) when other signs were approved and placed at different locations. So rather than four or five years of experience to give to the legislature, it is more like one to one and one half years of experience and information.

Because the legislature by Act 152 extended the sunset date to 2010, it at least provides more time to see how the legislation has worked. Further, there is a risk assessment group that should have made reports to the Board of Land and Natural Resources that can be reviewed by the legislature.

A sunset provision is included to give the proponents of the legislation as well as others the opportunity to collect sufficient information to present to the legislature so that the members could make a reasonable and informed decision as to whether the law they passed has worked and is still working in the way they intended.

Because these Acts have a major impact on consumer rights, HAJ feels it is more prudent to first obtain sufficient information on how the law has worked; that is, that immunity from negligence has had the effect it was intended to have – that it helped lifeguards do a better job in protecting beachgoers, residents and tourists alike; and that there are comprehensive plans for the state parks that provide more safety for the residents and tourists. We feel that the legislature should wait to fully assess the impact of this law during the 2010 session when it is scheduled to sunset and when the legislature can make it permanent or modify it according to the information presented.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.

Dr. Monty Downs
E.R. Physician, Wilcox Hospital &
Co-Chair, Kauai Water Safety Task Force
160 Lani Alii Place
Kapaa, Kauai, HI 96766

2/23/09

**To: Committee on Transportation, International and Intergovernmental Affairs
Senator J. Kalani English, Chair**

For: Meeting of March 18th, 2009, 1:45 p.m.

Subject: HB 1040, HD1 (HSCR 707)

TESTIMONY

Some prefacing comments:

HB 1040 was passed by the House Judiciary Committee on 2/23/09, "Defective to 2045". It was explained to me that the "defective" language basically means that the Judiciary Committee passed the Bill, but it was a weak pass ("wounded duck") and not a strong pass. I very much hope that Senator English's committee will read/hear my and others' testimonies and will see fit to launch HB 1040, a la Colt Brennan, for the Lifesaving touchdown that it merits.

Passage of HB 1040 will repeal the Sunsets of Act 82 and Act 170, sunsets which are due to take place on June 30, 2010. I, in my role as an ocean safety advocate, am not conversant with Act 82; and although what I do know about Act 82 makes good sense to me, I will leave it to others to testify on its behalf. My testimony will be about the Act 170 portion of HB 1040, and you will see that my testimony is about nothing less than life and death.

* * * * *

Act 170 -- This is very near and dear to me and to Kauai. As you know, this Act provides County Lifeguards with immunity (except in the case of gross negligence) when they are guarding State Beaches. This Act, along with State funding, is what has allowed Kauai County Lifeguards to work outside of their County Beach Park jurisdictions/areas and to cover Ke'e Beach, our very busy State Park that is at the northern end of the road. (The beach is so busy that if you want to go there you will be lucky to find a parking place within 1/4 mile.) After years of lobbying for Act 170 and for funding, our Ke'e Lifeguard service began on July 1, 2008 and County Lifeguards are at work there as you read this testimony. We Kauaians are extremely grateful to the State for accepting this responsibility for Ke'e State Beach Park.

Ke'e is very popular for snorkeling because of an outer protective reef that keeps the inside lagoon quite calm and placid appearing. But I'm sure you all are aware of how a protective reef can be a double-edged sword. When there are conditions, as there frequently are, where the waves break onto and over the reef, you now have the set-up for a strong Rip Current, the avenue/channel (often a veritable river) by which the incoming water equilibrates itself back out to sea. Many unsuspecting people have been caught in this Ke'e Beach rip current (see attached graphic depiction), and out they go down along the wild cliffs and waters of the NaPali

coastline. Only ½ the bodies are ever recovered. Our last death was 2 years ago, the co-pilot of a U.S. Airways flight. He was on 24 hour crew layover from their Phoenix-Kauai route. He and his pilot were snorkeling at Ke'e, next thing they were swept out the western portal of the lagoon, unnoticed by other beach goers. The pilot managed to scramble up onto a rock ledge somewhere down along the NaPali, and he worked his way up a cliff to the Kalalau trail and then back to Ke'e Beach from where he was able to call 911. Extensive multi-agency search and rescue was fruitless, our co-pilot was never found. His wife and 9 year old son (and a back-up airline crew) flew in the next day to try and deal with this, and if any of you had seen the young boy you too would be testifying here today.

For me personally, I now feel a happiness every single day knowing that Lifeguards are at Ke'e and that now we almost certainly won't have to endure another family catastrophe there. Look at these Ke'e numbers, compiled by the Lifeguards since 7/1/08:

Rescues	49
First Aid Assistance	333
Preventions	7,548
Public contacts	18,882
Total # of beach-goers	71,428

By these astonishing numbers you can see that this is very much of a "Prevention Tower", and the Lifeguards have to be good conversationalists/communicators as well as water-people! The Tower is right where you walk onto the beach, and you can see how many snorkelers and beach-goers (and trail-hikers) stop and talk with our Lifeguards. Terrific stuff in our challenged visitor-industry economy. How many deaths would there have been had there not been a Lifeguard? Well, even if the answer is One, I ask you to imagine if that one was a member of your family. Not good.

One other comment about the preventions at this Tower: Ke'e Beach is the starting point for the NaPali Coast trail, which takes you to a couple of extremely dangerous beaches called Hanakapiai and Kalalau. I believe our Ke'e Lifeguards have a significant impact on these dangers, since hikers regularly stop to chat with them about conditions before heading up the trail. Cell-phone communication from these beaches is impossible because of the Pali's, but we are looking into (via the private sector) setting up a satellite-technology Personal Radio Beacon that can be activated into our 911 system in an emergency. With this and with Jetskis, it's conceivable that our Ke'e Lifeguards may one day become able to actually have a meaningful shot at making rescues at these remote State/DLNR beaches. We did suffer a young man drowning at Hanakapiai in 2008, his friends had to run out the 2 miles of trail before any rescue could be attempted, and by then it was much too late.

It is of note that our great Kauai/Hanalei Lifeguards have already made a number of legendary Jetski rescues down along the NaPali, including in the years before Act 170 was in effect. (Flipped kayaks, etc.) It is not in their nature to let someone drown because of politics and liability concerns, and having Act 170 back them up has been a reward and an honor for them.





Please do not take away our Ke'e Lifeguards. Please do not let any more unsuspecting snorkelers die at Ke'e. Please repeal the sunset of Act 170 and please support HB 1040, HD1.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dr. Monty Downs
Kapaa, Kauai

HAZARDOUS OCEAN CONDITIONS RIP CURRENTS !



NA
PALI
COAST

illustrations by Patty Irons

FOR YOUR SAFETY- SWIM NEAR LIFEGUARDS!

get daily beach & surf info: www.kauaiexplorer.com

NORTH SHORE LIFEGUARD STATIONS: Hanalei Bay, Haena Beach Park, Ke'e Beach



IF YOU GET CAUGHT IN A RIP CURRENT:

Don't Panic

Don't Fight It

Relax until it Releases You

Swim Parallel to the Beach, then In



WAVEPROJECT

WATER AWARENESS - VISITOR EDUCATION
www.waveproject.net