

**PRESENTATION OF THE
HAWAII STATE BOXING COMMISSION**

TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
TOURISM, CULTURE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE
Regular Session of 2009

Monday, March 30, 2009
9:40 a.m.

**TESTIMONY ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 133 – REQUESTING
THE AUDITOR TO CONDUCT A FINANCIAL AND MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE
STATE BOXING COMMISSION OF HAWAII.**

TO THE HONORABLE JOEY MANAHAN, CHAIR,
AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Herbert B. Minn and I am the Chairperson of the State Boxing Commission of Hawaii (“Commission”). The Commission thanks you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to H.C.R. No. 133.

The purpose of H.C.R. No. 133 is to request the auditor to conduct a financial and management audit of the State Boxing Commission of Hawaii.

The Commission opposes H.C.R. No. 133 because the Commission was never given a chance to answer the complaints alleged in this concurrent resolution. It is the Commission’s understanding that these allegations and concerns originated from a letter addressed to the Hawaii Ethics Commission and sent to all senators. The Commission would like to address the allegations and concerns as follows:

1. “Issuing licenses for boxers pursuant to section 16-74-19, Hawaii Administrative Rules, without the required physician report.”

000031

The Commission has on file with every boxing license issued a physical examination, signed by a licensed Commission physician, on a form provided by the Commission.

2. "Failing to enforce section 16-74-97, Hawaii Administrative Rules, which requires that a Commission physician be present at all boxing bouts."

Two Commission physicians have been in attendance ringside at every boxing event.

3. "Refusing to permit interested parties from raising concerns about boxer license applicants abilities, resulting in unqualified boxers grossly mismatched with professional boxers."

The Commission utilizes a number of criteria, including interested parties to evaluate the ability of a boxer. In this incident the boxing coach believed his boxer was "grossly mismatched". The truth was his boxer went the entire four rounds and thus was not over matched. It is a given that a boxing coach is concerned for their boxers' well being but they may be too close to them and thus lose some objectivity.

4. "...the State Boxing Commission of Hawaii has failed to enforce section 16-74-218, Hawaii Administrative Rules, relating to contracts for bouts, resulting in boxers being unaware of the terms of their contract at the time of their fight".

The Commission agrees that there was an event where the standard copy of the Commission's bout agreement was not provided to the boxers in a timely fashion. This event took place in September 2008 and was the first professional boxing event since 2005. At that time, the Commission did not have an adequate supply of bout contracts

000032

and had placed a new order with the Department of Corrections Print Shop. Copies of the contracts were mailed to the boxers. This was an isolated incident and the Commission does not anticipate it occurring again.

5. "Concerns have been raised regarding the Chairperson of the State Boxing Commission of Hawaii allegedly soliciting amateur fighters and offering them incentives to turn professional, including offering to train them himself, which would be a potential conflict of interest."

As the Chairperson of the Commission I would like to state that these claims are totally unfounded.

6. "Concerns have been raised regarding the Vice Chairperson of the State Boxing Commission of Hawaii, whose husband was formally the head of Amateur Boxing in Hawaii and is under investigation by the National Amateur Boxing Association, allegedly being in a potential conflict of interest."

An inquiry was made to the Commission by the Hawaii Ethics Commission. The Ethics Commission was satisfied with the Commission's responses and determined there was no conflict. Also, this point is moot as one of the individuals in question is no longer the president of the Hawaii amateur boxing organization.

7. "Concerns have been raised regarding the State Boxing Commission of Hawaii's refusal to approve an organization's application for contests, despite the organization having submitted the appropriate documentation."

According to our records, the referenced application was received on

000033

December 30, 2008 and approved by the Commission on January 23, 2009. The application had to be approved at a Commission meeting and the Commission was bound by a six day public hearing notice requirement. The Commission believes there was no "refusal" to approve the application and it was done so in a timely manner.

The Commission believes it has satisfactorily addressed the allegations and concerns raised in H.C.R. No. 133. Therefore, we respectfully request that this concurrent resolution be held.

Thank you for allowing us to present our perspectives on the allegations and concerns in H.C.R. No. 133.