<u>SB989</u>

Measure Title: RELATING TO PRIVATE DETECTIVES AND GUARDS.

Report Title: Private Detectives and Guards; Board Composition

Description: Requires that of the two persons on the Board of Detectives and Guards who are actively engaged in any of the licensed practices, one shall be a public employee.

Companion:

Package: None

Current Referral: CPN, JDL

Introducer(s): TANIGUCHI

Sort by Date		Status Text	
1/28/2015	S	Introduced.	
1/28/2015	S	Passed First Reading.	
1/28/2015	S	Referred to CPN, JDL.	
1/30/2015	S	The committee(s) on CPN has scheduled a public hearing on 02-04-15 9:00AM in conference room 229.	

PRESENTATION OF THE BOARD OF PRIVATE DETECTIVES AND GUARDS

TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

TWENTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATURE Regular Session of 2015

Wednesday, February 4, 2015 9:00 a.m.

TESTIMONY ON SENATE BILL NO. 989, RELATING TO PRIVATE DETECTIVES AND GUARDS.

TO THE HONORABLE ROSALYN H. BAKER, CHAIR, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Charlene Tamanaha, Executive Officer of the Board of Private Detectives and Guards ("Board"). Thank you for the opportunity to testify on Senate Bill No. 989, which proposes to change the composition of the Board to mandate that one of the two licensed members (one private detective and one guard) shall be a public employee.

While the Board has not had the opportunity to review this bill, it will at its February 12, 2015 meeting. As there is no formal Board position, I would like to raise some administrative concerns with this measure.

The Board is already having difficulty raising quorum as it is currently short one licensee member. Requiring one licensee member to now be a public employee will narrow the pool of potential members and make it more difficult to fill vacant positions as there are no means to determine which licensees are public employees. The current language of HRS section 463-2 already allows the appointment of a public employee Testimony on Senate Bill No. 989 Wednesday, February 4, 2015 Page 2

who is a licensed principal guard or detective, should one be available. Thus, the amendment is unnecessary and very restrictive.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs' administrative concerns on Senate Bill No. 989, and we will provide your committee with the Board's determination after its February 12, 2015 meeting.

<u>SB989</u> Submitted on: 2/2/2015 Testimony for CPN on Feb 4, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 229

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
t.masuda	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments: Believe the Board of Guards and P.Is can best judge who should be on the board and why pay for another expensive gov. employee.