

LATE

SB2286

Submitted on: 1/25/2014

Testimony for HMS on Jan 25, 2014 10:00AM in Conference Room 229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Scott Wall	Community Alliance for Mental Health	Support	No

Comments: To: The Senate Committee on Human Services Aloha Sen. Chun-Oakland and members of the Committee, On behalf of the Community Alliance for Mental Health as well as United Self Help we would like to support SB2286. Unless placed under restrictions such as a rep-payee all disabled persons are considered capable of handling their own finances and should not be subject to coercion of any kind. Scott Wall VP/Legislative Advocate Community Alliance for Mental Health

LATE

From: arvid <thirr33@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 25, 2014 12:31 PM
To: HMS Testimony
Cc: Tyrell Maae
Subject: Late & Verbal Testimonies for HMS Committee Notice of Hearing 1/25/14 10 am, ROom 229

Chair, Senate HMS Services Committee
Right Honorable Committee Members

Happy New Year and Happy Chinese New Year!

This E-mail provides a written follow-up to my earlier testimony delivered before the Committee. Thanks for providing me an opportunity to speak up without prior notice or a written testimony submittal.

In summary:

I support SB 2545, SB 2544, SB 2534, SB 2337, SB 2395, SB 2286, and SB 2269. I did not submit written or verbal comments regarding SB 2211, SB 2525, SB 2542, SB 2267, SB 2442, SB 2266, SB 2265, & SB 2541. I did not arrive for testimony until SB 2545 was discussed.

Any comments or reactions I have expressed, I prefer that they be incorporated into the Committee report as recommendations to the JDL & the WAM committees. I do not promote any amendments or deferrals.

However, the defective dates, 3 amendments for agenda items, & a deferral of SB 2260 until Feb. 4, 2014 are perfectly discretionary as well as prudent.

My preference in general regarding SB 2269 is not to go with a pilot program, task force, and/or a working group effective on July 1, 2015. Also, I would like to see 85+ positions be all filled by public sector employees and no exemptions be granted to fill any or all positions with contract employees (private sector).

This exemption from civil service rules side-steps the collective bargaining agreements and is tantamount to "unfair management practice". Once or more often granted, these exemptions will become or continue to be the norm, and this is not acceptable. Consultants working shoulder to shoulder with civil servants are difficult to distinguish, except for cost-benefit analysis to determine if such arrangements benefit the tax payers in the end.

Mahalo for accepting my late written summary of the measures to which I commented in general support, albeit, some with reservations.

Me Ke Aloha Pumehana,

Arvid T. Youngquist
Registered Voter