

FIFTY-SEVENTH DAY

Monday, April 26, 2010

The Senate of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawai'i, Regular Session of 2010, convened at 9:27 a.m. with the President in the Chair.

The Divine Blessing was invoked by the Reverend Alan Urasaki, Pacific Buddhist Academy, after which the Roll was called showing all Senators present with the exception of Senators Bunda and Ihara who were excused.

The President announced that she had read and approved the Journal of the Fifty-Sixth Day.

At this time, the following introductions were made to members of the Senate:

Senator Chun Oakland introduced a group of 5th grade students and teachers from Ma'ema'e Elementary School.

Senator Chun Oakland also introduced Philip Wong, Director General of Taiwan, who would be leaving after five years of service in Hawai'i. Accompanying Mr. Wong was Director Oliver Wang.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

The following messages from the Governor (Gov. Msg. Nos. 513 to 516) were read by the Clerk and were placed on file:

Gov. Msg. No. 513, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill No. 2770, S.D. 1, H.D. 2 as Act 51, entitled: "RELATING TO REMOTE DISPENSING PHARMACY."

Gov. Msg. No. 514, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill No. 2597, H.D. 1 as Act 52, entitled: "RELATING TO THE HAWAII EMPLOYERS' MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY."

Gov. Msg. No. 515, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the Governor signed into law House Bill No. 2197, H.D. 1, S.D. 1 as Act 53, entitled: "RELATING TO CONDOMINIUMS."

Gov. Msg. No. 516, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill No. 2898, S.D. 1, H.D. 1 as Act 54, entitled: "RELATING TO DIVERSION PROGRAM FOR CHEMICALLY DEPENDANT NURSES."

HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications from the House (Hse. Com. Nos. 619 to 624) were read by the Clerk and were placed on file:

Hse. Com. No. 619, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the House reconsidered its action taken on March 16, 2010, in disagreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senate to H.B. No. 2708, H.D. 1 (S.D. 1).

Hse. Com. No. 620, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the House reconsidered its action taken on April 7, 2010, in disagreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senate to H.B. No. 2129, H.D. 1 (S.D. 1).

Hse. Com. No. 621, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the House disagreed to the amendments proposed by the Senate to the following House concurrent resolutions:

H.C.R. No. 50, H.D. 2 (S.D. 1);
H.C.R. No. 284 (S.D. 1); and

H.C.R. No. 292, H.D. 1 (S.D. 1).

Hse. Com. No. 622, informing the Senate that on April 23, 2010, the Speaker appointed conferees on the part of the House for the consideration of amendments proposed by the Senate to the following House concurrent resolutions:

H.C.R. No. 50, H.D. 2 (S.D. 1):

Representatives Ito, Tokioka, Co-Chairs; Har, Ching.

H.C.R. No. 284 (S.D. 1):

Representatives Manahan, Tokioka, Co-Chairs; Finnegan.

H.C.R. No. 292, H.D. 1 (S.D. 1):

Representatives Ito, Har, Co-Chairs; Thielen.

Hse. Com. No. 623, returning S.C.R. No. 150, which was adopted by the House of Representatives on April 23, 2010.

Hse. Com. No. 624, informing the Senate that on April 22, 2010, the House disagreed to the amendments proposed by the Senate to the following House concurrent resolutions:

H.C.R. No. 296 (S.D. 1); and
H.C.R. No. 297 (S.D. 1).

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Senator Hee, for the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing vote of the House to the amendments proposed by the Senate to H.B. No. 1015, H.D. 1, presented a report (Conf. Com. Rep. No. 154-10) recommending that H.B. No. 1015, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, as amended in C.D. 1, pass Final Reading.

In accordance with Article III, Section 15 of the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 154-10 and H.B. No. 1015, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS TRUST FUND," was deferred for a period of 48 hours.

Senator Sakamoto, for the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing vote of the House to the amendments proposed by the Senate to H.B. No. 2377, H.D. 3, presented a report (Conf. Com. Rep. No. 155-10) recommending that H.B. No. 2377, H.D. 3, S.D. 2, as amended in C.D. 1, pass Final Reading.

In accordance with Article III, Section 15 of the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 155-10 and H.B. No. 2377, H.D. 3, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EDUCATION," was deferred for a period of 48 hours.

Senator Sakamoto, for the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing vote of the Senate to the amendments proposed by the House to S.B. No. 2589, S.D. 2, presented a report (Conf. Com. Rep. No. 156-10) recommending that S.B. No. 2589, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, as amended in C.D. 1, pass Final Reading.

In accordance with Article III, Section 15 of the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 156-10 and S.B. No. 2589, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CHARTER SCHOOLS," was deferred for a period of 48 hours.

Senator Sakamoto, for the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing vote of the Senate to the amendments proposed by the House to S.B. No. 2124, S.D. 2, presented a report (Conf. Com. Rep. No. 157-10) recommending that S.B. No. 2124, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, as amended in C.D. 1, pass Final Reading.

In accordance with Article III, Section 15 of the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 157-10 and S.B. No. 2124, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE HAWAII HURRICANE RELIEF FUND," was deferred for a period of 48 hours.

Senator Chun Oakland, for the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing vote of the Senate to the amendments proposed by the House to S.B. No. 2469, S.D. 2, presented a report (Conf. Com. Rep. No. 158-10) recommending that S.B. No. 2469, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, as amended in C.D. 1, pass Final Reading.

In accordance with Article III, Section 15 of the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 158-10 and S.B. No. 2469, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE EMERGENCY AND BUDGET RESERVE FUND," was deferred for a period of 48 hours.

Senator Chun Oakland, for the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing vote of the House to the amendments proposed by the Senate to H.B. No. 2774, H.D. 2, presented a report (Conf. Com. Rep. No. 159-10) recommending that H.B. No. 2774, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, as amended in C.D. 1, pass Final Reading.

In accordance with Article III, Section 15 of the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 159-10 and H.B. No. 2774, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HUMAN SERVICES," was deferred for a period of 48 hours.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

Senator Kim, for the Committee on Ways and Means, presented a report (Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3234) recommending that H.B. No. 2094 pass Third Reading.

By unanimous consent, action on Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3234 and H.B. No. 2094, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE BONDS TO ASSIST HAWAII PACIFIC HEALTH," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

ORDER OF THE DAY

ADVISE AND CONSENT

MATTERS DEFERRED FROM WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2010

Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3207 (Gov. Msg. No. 341):

By unanimous consent, Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3207 was received and placed on file.

Senator Hee moved that the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of RANSOM A.K. PILTZ to the Land Use Commission, term to expire June 30, 2014, seconded by Senator Tokuda.

Senator Hee rose in opposition to the nomination and said:

"You know, this isn't something that's personal. I don't know the individual. This is all about the nominee's voting record. This is all about the nominee's seriousness in the advise and consent process. This is all about the nominee's evident lack of understanding of issues broader than quasi-judicial proceeding.

"As I said last week, the nominee's response as an indicator of the seriousness in which the Committee asked two questions regarding the future of Hawai'i, specifically to prime ag, and asked each of the four nominees to please limit yourself to 300 words per question. The nominee was so serious about the job; the nominee took the process of advise and consent so serious as a returning member of the Land Use Commission—

not a first guy up to bat, but someone who had sat as a member of the Land Use Commission, not for four years, for five years, five years. The nominee took the advise and consent process so seriously that his answers for two questions, not one, were four paragraphs; and let me read you the last paragraph (I know it by heart): 'Mahalo for the opportunity to serve.' That's paragraph four.

"This is a nominee who will sit in judgment over the future of prime ag lands; and as someone told me recently, he never met a developer he never liked. This is a nominee whose voting record is clear: He never met a developer he never liked when it came to prime ag lands.

"From the caucus, we learned he had some personal issues. I feel bad for him. I don't know why that was brought up, but let the record show I feel bad for him. I feel bad for all of you if you have personal issues; all of you.

"This nominee was asked numerous times on every vote he took, and on several occasions, he couldn't remember. He couldn't recall. He didn't know. He forgot. You folks have it in your DVD. He shrugged his shoulders; and on two occasions, he flat-out lied. And this is the nominee that is up for consideration to continue as a member of the Land Use Commission?

"I think enough has been said about this person. Nice man. Probably good guy to sit on a picnic bench and chalangalang with, but that's not what this is: a picnic bench to chalangalang. This is about someone who will sit in judgment over additional homes of 33,000 already approved on West O'ahu, of 12,000 or 14 percent of prime ag that's up to bat at Ho'opili, of 5,000 at Koa Ridge. Is there anyone who thinks, based on his voting record, that this nominee will turn his back to the developers and stand in support of the future generations of the State of Hawai'i? Is there anyone who thinks that if the people whom all of us represent understood how this nominee votes, that the people would say, 'Send him back. We need him; and when we disagree, don't worry. He won't remember. Send him back.'

"We had the luxury of extra time to look in the *2008 Data Book*. We spent some time in caucus talking about the quasi-judicial process. Well, let's talk about non-quasi-judicial issues. Let's talk about people issues. Let's talk about, according to the *Data Book*, that adding 3,500 homes will add 5,339 cars to the road. Adding 12,000 homes will add 18,360 cars on the road. Adding 15,000 homes will add 23,715 cars. Adding 15,500 homes would be like doubling the traffic coming from the Mililani master planned community, which has 16,000 homes, and an estimated 16,000 homes and 24,000 cars.

"This nominee may not have sat in judgment for Mililani Mauka, but this nominee will sit in judgment for Ho'opili. This nominee will sit in judgment for Koa Ridge. This nominee will vote for these projects despite the Department of Ag testifying in opposition to Ho'opili, despite the Department of Transportation testifying in opposition, despite the Office of State Planning testifying in opposition. This Land Use Commission is not balanced. This Land Use Commission believes on the presumption that if you own the land, you can develop the land; as opposed to the rudimentary discussion that if you own the land, you must prove that it is in the best interest of all the people of Hawai'i why you wish to do what with the land. And when it's prime ag in developable condition, fully irrigated, this nominee should be asked the question: How is it that prime ag takes a back seat to more cars, more oil, more non-sustainable issues, more than 90 percent of the goods imported to Hawai'i?

"This nominee has proved by his record of votes that he does not bring balance and is not consistent with the people, the people we represent, because at no time could he defend his

positions and his votes in Committee. But then again, when your response is one page, four paragraphs, of which the last paragraph is 'mahalo,' how could you expect anything less from a nominee like this? I will vote 'no.'"

Senator Kokubun rose in support of the nomination and said:

"I think a number of very good issues have been brought up by the previous speaker and I think those are primarily policy issues with regard to how we treat our agricultural lands. As we have passed legislation regarding the designation of important agricultural lands that has been mandated by our constitution for close to 30 years before anything was finally done, I think it is a statement that this body, this Legislature as a whole, is now willing to take a closer look at those kinds of policy decisions. This session, we did have a bill that Senator Hee sponsored that talked about protecting our A and B lands to a higher degree, primarily by imposing a supermajority vote of the Land Use Commission to approve any development on A and B lands. Unfortunately, that bill did not pass, but I think these are the areas that we should be exploring to provide more clarification about our policy on agricultural lands. And while on that subject, by the way, I think that the 'A and B lands' designated as prime ag lands, really was based on a study of soil conditions only that was conducted many, many years ago by the Land Study Bureau, and certainly that needs to be reviewed today given better research and information. I'll give you a personal example: On the Big Island, we have very little A and B lands; in fact, there are no A lands and very, very little B lands. Most of our lands are C, D, and E, but people recognize that there is huge potential for agriculture on the Big Island. And for those reasons, I think it's important that some kind of review, hopefully by the Office of State Planning, can be done on all of our agricultural lands given the input about the technological changes that have occurred in the industry and how production has been altered primarily from sugar and pine to more diversified crops. So, I think these issues are very important to talk about.

"The Land Use Commission, as established in law, does operate in a different manner in terms of their decision making. The quasi-judicial designation is very, very different than what we are typically dealing with, the quasi-legislative process. So this quasi-judicial decision making process is imposed to ensure that the rights of those who are most directly affected are accorded due process before an action is taken. In addition to the petitioner, the Office of Planning and the respective county planning departments are mandatory parties to the proceedings. Individuals or organizations may intervene to demonstrate why their interests are particularly affected or distinguishable from those of the general public; and that policy has been very liberally construed by the Land Use Commission. There have been very, very few denials of intervenor status for people who feel that they have certain rights with respect to that certain parcel of land; and also that all participants in the proceedings may be represented through an attorney because this is a quasi-judicial process.

"The important thing about this that I think distinguishes it from other decision making processes is that after the testimony and exhibits have all been received by the Land Use Commission, all parties then submit specific documents called 'findings of fact, conclusions of law, and decision and order,' and these are drawn strictly from the record and proposed to the Land Use Commission; and that is what the Land Use Commission and its staff utilize to come up with their decision. So this is very, very important, particularly when you know that the decision is directly appealable to the Circuit Court.

"Now, how are these decisions made by the Land Use Commission? I think the decision making criteria is very, very important. The Land Use law requires the Commission to specifically consider the following criteria in review of any

petition for a boundary amendment: conformity to the goals, objectives, and policies of the Hawai'i State Plan, Chapter 226, and the functional plans adopted pursuant to the State Plan. Now this is something that we have been trying to amend particularly through our sustainability initiative, but nevertheless there already exists the State Plan and there is some guidance in that. So the Land Use Commission, must base their decision on that first criteria.

"The second criteria is the extent to which the proposed reclassification conforms to the applicable district standards, the impacts on the following state concerns (and this is what's important in my opinion): preservation or maintenance of important natural systems or habitats; maintenance of valued cultural, historical, or natural resources; maintenance of other natural resources relevant to Hawaii's economy, including but not limited to agricultural resources; commitment of state funds and resources; provision for employment opportunities and economic development; and provision for housing opportunities for all income groups, particularly the low-, low-moderate, and gap groups. What is relevant to this discussion and where the Legislature should certainly consider clarifying our policy is with respect to that criteria regarding 'maintenance of other natural resources relevant to Hawaii's economy, including but not limited to agricultural resources.' In my mind, that does not give enough significance to the importance of agricultural resources. The whole discussion about self-sufficiency, both in food security as well as energy security, is something that has really come to the forefront within the last few years; and within that context, it would be important to re-look at our policies regarding agricultural lands.

"The other issue that needs to be clarified, in terms of A and B lands in particular, is the fact that there also is the 15 acre rule. That's where the Legislature—I believe it was back in the early 80's—delegated to the counties the ability to change the district classifications on 15 acres or less. This was not limited in any way to non-A and B lands; so the counties, if they so chose, do have the decision making authority over 15 acres or less on a petition to change land use designation that would come forward for all lands, including A and B lands included. So this inconsistency, again, is something that if the intent of the Legislature is really to protect our best agricultural lands (for good reason and I totally support that), then I think that all of these areas of the law need to be looked at.

"Another issue I want to emphasize is the role of the Office of Planning, as well as the respective county planning departments. The Office of Planning is supposed to be the advocate for state policy, so they should have influence in front of the Land Use Commission. And the county planning departments also advocate for compliance with their county general plans and subsets of those plans, like community development plans, etc. This is an important component that the Land Use Commission must take into consideration in their decisions. And again, please keep in mind that any and all decisions are appealable to the Circuit Court.

"The other policy issue that I think we need to revisit is that in the law now, there is a mandatory five year boundary review process that should be undertaken by the Office of Planning. This is something that was imposed by the Legislature in its wisdom to re-look at all of the classifications as they currently stand because we know that nothing is static. We know that things change and needs change, as I have mentioned previously about our greater desire to be less dependent on imports. And so, this five year boundary review is very critical in looking at all the land designations, not just agricultural lands, but rural lands as well. And if you recall, we did pass a bill (I think it was three sessions ago) that asked the Office of Planning to report back to us with recommendations on how to better utilize the rural designation because we felt that by

having rural designations included in a more prominent way, it would be a good step towards protecting our agricultural lands. Well, the truth of the matter is that the last boundary review was conducted in 1992, and that is certainly not acceptable, and I think it's something that we should be demanding of the Office of Planning. Similarly, the report regarding better utilization of the rural designation has also not been submitted to us.

"Now, the two specific projects that have been mentioned by the previous speaker include Ho'opili and Koa Ridge; and as you know, the decisions on those are pending, particularly Koa Ridge, which is still before the Land Use Commission. Ho'opili was remanded, in a sense, back so that additional considerations would be given prior to any vote. So, in my opinion, speculating on how any commissioner would vote on either of those cases or on any case, frankly, is just that—pure speculation. And so, I would rely on the fact that this nominee in particular has quite an extensive background in planning. He served as the chairman of the Maui County Planning Commission and has been an advocate for Maui issues, because that's the way the Land Use Commission is intended to function with a member from each county represented on the Land Use Commission.

"And so for those reasons, colleagues, I really feel that Mr. Piltz, based on what we know about him and what we know of him as an advocate, is a very worthy nominee and should continue as a land use commissioner. Thank you."

Senator Hooser rose in opposition to the nomination and said:

"I'll keep my remarks very, very brief. I had not planned on speaking, but, you know, it's important issues and I share both the previous speakers' feeling and values, in terms of the protection of ag lands. And serving four years on the Kaua'i County Council, watching planning commissions throughout our state, watching the Land Use Commission, I have come to the conclusion that what's really important, Madam President and colleagues, is not the rule book. It's not the process and procedures. It's the people. And we need balance. Desperately, we need balance because it's the people who make these decisions, and it's the people who often ignore the criteria, the policies, and the procedures; people that will vote against the recommendation from the Department of Agriculture, vote against the recommendations from the Department of Planning and the Department of Transportation, and vote consistently over and over and over again in support of developments, and rarely, if ever (and in this case, I don't think 'ever' from the record I've heard), will vote to deny developers the authority to move forward to develop on agricultural lands.

"Madam President, I understand this is a quasi-judicial process, and I understand that the people have the power and right to appeal to the courts, but I also understand that in many cases, year after year after year the people will go to the Land Use Commission and ask for support and be told over and over again, 'No.' And if they have enough money, if they have enough time, if they have enough energy, if they can get together the attorneys to do so, they will take it to the courts; and it's been demonstrated recently the courts will support the people, but it's only after years and years and years sometimes and much energy. And it's really the people that vote—the Land Use commissioners themselves who make these decisions. And we need balance. We need to draw a line in the sand at some point to say what's important to us. And I could not say it any better than the Chair of the Water-Land Committee. I could not say it with more passion. I could not say it with more eloquence. I could not say it with more substance and fact than the Chair of the Water-Land Committee, but I do share that passion. I share those values; and I will be voting 'no' also on the nominee. Thank you."

Senator Hee rose in rebuttal and said:

"You know, I appreciate the previous two speakers. I would like to offer some comments. I will try to be a little more dispassionate if the members will indulge me in my effort.

"You know, one of the previous speakers talked about, 'Well, there's a IAL. There's a process; and we still need to go here, and we still need to go there, and we need to look at new laws.' And I agree with all of that. We don't have the luxury of time to do these things because it doesn't mean the rest of the world stops until we're done with our work, because our work is never done.

"The Vice President spoke about the qualifications—former planning commissioner or planning director, whatever. How about just a regular person? How about someone from the League of Women Voters? How about someone from the University of Hawai'i Law School? How about just someone? If we put all planning commissioners or planning directors, why have a Land Use Commission?

"The Vice President used the word 'advocate' to describe this nominee. I agree with that; never met a developer he never liked. And I will tell you this: But for lack of time, we would have dug into the projects that he voted upon to see if his electrical contracting business was a subcontractor on any jobs. We did not have the time, but don't anyone think for one second that assertion hasn't been made to this Committee.

"The last thing is that this idea that, 'Oh, don't worry about it; you can appeal it to the courts.' As if there's enough money in my pocket to appeal it to the court. That's justification for these decisions? 'Oh, don't worry, regular people; you can appeal it to the court.' Well, what happened when it was appealed to the court? The Supreme Court just came out with a decision which requires a resort on the North Shore of this island to get a new EIS. That's what happened when it was appealed to the court 30 years later. 'Don't worry; you can appeal it to the court.' As if any one of us has the resources and time available to each of us to hire a lawyer, hire another lawyer, keep paying the bills, and appeal it to the court. Wow, what a concept. And if you succeed at the Circuit Court, get ready. You're going to appeal it to the Supreme Court. And 30 years later, ho, ho, ho, the EIS is outdated. We needed a court to tell us after 30 years the traffic has changed, the population has changed, the consumption of water has changed. We need that? No. The Land Use commissioners need to understand that. That's the issue here.

"This is what a legislator wrote. He wrote it on September 3, 2009. 'It is important to realize that today, Hawai'i imports nearly 90 percent of our food. This dependency siphons billions from our economy each year, and as the costs of oil and shipping continue to rise, so too will prices at the grocery store.' He's not a land use commissioner; he's a legislator. 'So it's concerning that 11,750 new homes would be built over 14 percent of Oahu's best ag lands, which is a major contributor to our local food economy and critical to a viable ag industry.' He continues: 'Back in 1997 when the plan for more homes,' (and this is where planning commissions are so important) 'when the plan for more homes in 'Ewa was originally developed, it may have been good policy at that time. However, since then available farm land in Hawai'i has declined by more than 22 percent and the cost of shipping food to the islands has skyrocketed. As a result, in the last decade there has been a paradigm shift in public policy with a new focus on diversifying our economy and redeveloping local agriculture.' He's a freshman. A freshman wrote this, not some old hack who'd been through it all over and over and over again.

“And this is my last comment and I will sit: From the Governor on down, everyone agrees we should become less reliant on cars, more reliant on locally grown food and energy. We voted to build a mass transit system to take cars off the road and focus growth around a dense urban core. As private investors, homeowners, and as a community, we’re pouring billions into biofuel power plants, undersea electric cables, photovoltaics, wind farms, electrical car charging stations, algae-to-energy research, and a slew of other projects to promote a sustainable future.

“This nominee is out of step with a sustainable future. Thank you.”

Senator Hemmings rose in opposition to the nomination and said:

“I wish to make a disclaimer first and foremost that I’m suffering from a grievous personal issue: I’m a Republican, and I will further illuminate to this body that I wholeheartedly endorsed this nominee in previous advise and consent.

“Having said that, there’s some very interesting issues that address the very essence of why we are here. Oftentimes in land use, there are great lawsuits regarding takings. Someone who has a vested right has them taken away from them because of legislative action. Very seldom do we hear much about the opposite, which, for lack of better terms, I would call ‘givings,’ where a developer, in this case by the simple purchasing of lands at a deflated rate because of its use as agriculture, then turns and through political manipulation, friendships, or whatever the reasons may be (possibly perfectly good ones) they receive what I would call ‘givings.’ All of a sudden agricultural land is turned into residential land and ups or triples and quadruples its value.

“These are issues we have to look at. I don’t necessarily agree that private land always has to be utilized in what’s best for all the people. I do believe that private landowners have vested rights. But I also believe that in the case of ‘givings,’ the public has vested rights to utilize that land as it was originally designated; in this case, agriculture versus growth.

“The good news for everyone making a decision here today—I know you all discussed it in caucus at great length—is that this nominee, we’re not speculating on. The good senator who heads Water-Land has illuminated this individual’s voting record, and it’s clearly, clearly, pro-development, even development of what should be ‘important agricultural lands.’ I hope your caucus discussed quite extensively Ho‘opili and Koa Ridge because there’s an undeniable huge impact on the quality of life on this island. I’m not holding my breath until the multi-billion dollar boondoggle rail gets built. So the undeniable truth is if we put thousands or more homes on the urban plain, it will have a tremendous impact on the quality of life of all of us. We’re all headed towards gridlock already. What’s really sad is there is an alternative. There is smart growth. We can have density in the urban core and not need to subsidize massive rail systems and transit. So to say that we need the housing is probably true; to say that we need it on important agricultural lands is not true because there is a sustainable alternative.

“And let’s talk about sustainability. I served on the 2050 Commission, as I previously stated, and I believe that there is a real argument to be made about self-sufficiency and sustainability. I don’t think the winter solstice of 2012 is upon us yet, but I do believe that we no longer live in insular economies. How vulnerable are we here in Hawai‘i? I would say extremely so. So, sustainability is more than just a word having to do with conservation of the environment. I think it has a lot to do with conservation of life as we know it in these islands. If gasoline does go to \$5, \$6, \$7 a gallon as it could, and tourists don’t fly here, how do we sustain? But more

importantly, if our important agricultural lands are built upon, in the future if something of great importance affects us, can we say, ‘Well, all right, we can go back to those lands and promote sustainability?’ No, we can’t because there will be private homes built on what would have been land to sustain these islands.

“There are some other issues here. There were some strong accusations made. I’d like to know: Did the nominee lie? I don’t know, but certainly those questions should be answered. Is there imbalance in the Land Use Commission? I’d say from what I’ve seen in the record, their record, I would say ‘yes.’ The question I think the Majority has to ask themselves today—and as we do in the Minority caucus, and it was an interesting debate in our caucus. Sam, I think we were split on it, right? We decided to come out here and listen to the debate, and I think the debate has reinforced my position. Where do we draw the line for the future of this state, for the preservation of important agricultural lands, and for the well being of the people that may yet be unborn? I believe we do need to have a balanced Land Use Commission that’s going to make decisions that really will promote smart growth, sustainability, preservation of important agricultural lands, and our lifestyle as we know it.

“I would urge the Majority caucus to think long and hard about this and vote ‘no’ against this nominee in hopes that we can achieve what I know we’re all trying to legislate. Now is the time to draw the line. Thank you, Madam President.”

Senator Hee rose to request a Roll Call vote, and the Chair so ordered.

The motion was put by the Chair and, Roll Call vote having been requested, carried on the following showing of Ayes and Noes:

Ayes, 13; Ayes with Reservations (Espero, Fukunaga, Gabbard, Nishihara, Taniguchi, Tsutsui). Noes, 10 (Chun Oakland, Galuteria, Green, Hee, Hemmings, Hooser, Ige, Kidani, Kim, Slom). Excused, 2 (Bunda, Ihara).

Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3208 (Gov. Msg. No. 338):

By unanimous consent, Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3208 was received and placed on file.

Senator Hee moved that the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of DUANE KANUHA to the Land Use Commission, term to expire June 30, 2013, seconded by Senator Tokuda.

Senator Hee rose in opposition to the nomination and said:

“I don’t speak against him because he’s a rubber stamp, which he is. That’s not the issue. I don’t rise to speak against him because he’s a former planning commissioner or director of planning, which he is. That’s not the issue.

“The issue is the law; and regardless how anyone wishes to couch the law, the law is the law. In our caucus, a bill introduced by the Senate President required ‘that one member shall have substantial experience or expertise in traditional Hawaiian land usage and knowledge of cultural land practices.’ It doesn’t say ‘the next member.’ It doesn’t say ‘when you get around to it.’ It doesn’t say ‘the Legislature shall enforce.’ It says, ‘One member shall be appointed from each of the counties and the remainder shall be appointed at large, provided that one member shall have substantial experience or expertise in traditional Hawaiian land usage and knowledge of cultural land practices.’ That’s what the law says; regardless of what we may have intended or what we may have hoped, this is what the law says.

“Whether the nominee likes it or not, he is the designee. Whether that designation came from God himself or herself, he is the designee provided by the Governor through Dan Davidson to this Committee. You folks have the DVDs. When the nominee was asked is he the designee, his answer was, ‘No, I’m not.’ My response was, ‘Yes, you are.’ His response back was, ‘Not me.’ And my response was, ‘Well, let me read it to you.’ And his response was, ‘Not me.’ Well, if it’s not you, then the executive director, could he be wrong? Or the Governor? Or the Governor’s appointing authority? Who should we blame? Because at the end of the day, all we know is what we’re provided, and what we were provided is: He, the nominee, is the Hawaiian expert. And with all due respect to the nominee, he is no Hawaiian expert in my book. He is someone like me, who grew up to get a good education to get a good job so you can have two cars in the garage, and get along to go along. And he climbed that political ladder as the previous nominee. It’s time to get serious.

“If you were here in ’06—and that includes most of us but the senator from Mililani, the senator from Kapolei, the senator from Waikīkī—you voted ‘yes.’ Even if you were in the House at the time, you voted ‘yes’; 49 aye, 0 no, 2 excused. You voted ‘yes.’ So all of us but three voted ‘yes’ to construct the law—not enforce the law, construct the law—that one member, whoever they designate, shall be—not ‘may’ be—shall be the Hawaiian cultural expert.

“Pukui has a definition, an ‘ōlelo no‘eau: ‘he Hawai‘i ‘ualakahiki,’ an Irish potato Hawaiian, a term of derision applied to a native Hawaiian who apes the ways of the whites instead of appreciating the culture of his own people; also said to one who is absolutely ignorant of his own culture. ‘He Hawai‘i ‘ualakahiki.’ To save the nominee embarrassment, which I regret today given the discussion in the caucus, I would have asked him, ‘Do you speak the language of your ancestors?’ I know the answer, and that’s why I didn’t ask him. I would have asked him, ‘To what is the definition of “āina,” but I know what he would have said: ‘Land.’ ‘Āina is not ‘land’ in our culture. ‘Āina—‘ai ana: to ‘ai, to eat. Ana: the process of eating. ‘Ai ana ‘āina. That’s where ‘āina comes from—not the land. It is that which sustains you. If I asked the nominee, ‘What is ‘wai?’ ‘Water.’ No; wealth. The wai is what brings to life all things in our culture. ‘Waiwai’ as in ‘kanaka waiwai’: the man who has riches. Kānāwai: law. Kānāwai: law. If I asked the nominee, ‘Tell me the difference, or is there a difference as Hawaiian people to ask where are you from?’ ‘Aia hea ‘oe? Or should it be ‘auhea ‘oe? Or should it be no hea mai ‘oe: to which land do you belong—no hea mai ‘oe. Not ‘aia i hea. Not ‘auhea ‘oe. No hea mai ‘oe. And that applies to all of us. Before my Chinese grandfather died, he went home to China because that’s the land in his heart where he belonged. It is no different than all of us who go back home to the Philippines, go back home to Japan, go back home to where you come from because that is a gap in your life that needs fulfillment. And that is the gap in native Hawaiians in their homeland: the vacuum of who we are. No hea mai ‘oe: to which land do you belong? No Waipi‘o. Immediately, the asker knows he belongs to Waipi‘o. He belongs to ‘Umi-a-liloa. He belongs to Paka‘alana. No hea mai ‘oe: to which land do you belong? How could it be expected of this Hawai‘i ‘ualakahiki to know? It would be asking too much. Cultural expert? Not to me. Planning director? Shoots, brah; you got that puka filled.

“So who then? Well, how about Mapuana de Silva? No planning experience but she get the ‘i‘o; she know her people. How about Brother Hewett? Not a planner there. How about Auntie Aggie? How about Auntie Aggie? Ah, she’s old. She don’t know; probably no mo’ B.A., but she get honorary Ph.D. How about Gladys Brandt, if she was still alive? How about Chinky Mahoe? How about Nainoa Thompson? About Uncle

Harry Kunihi Mitchell? How about Walter Ritte? How about Emmett Aluli? How about Glenn Davis? How about Joyce Kainoa? Nah, but they not planners, and you gotta be one planner to be in this little club, this enclave of quasi-judicial processors. How about Clara Ku? How about Auntie Harriet May? How Auntie Esther Lynn Kee? About Auntie Lani Kapuni? How about Auntie Rachel Pu‘ilihao?

“Somebody is going to get up and say, ‘The committee report said the next person was supposed to be. That’s what the committee report said because that’s the intent of the law.’ All of us here been long enough here to understand convenience. The intent of the law is clear: ‘one member shall be.’ We don’t pick who shall be, not one of us on this floor, regardless that we voted for the law. That’s not our job. Our job is to enforce the law. So, no matter what the razzmatazz is coming up next, this individual—probably one good guy that can sit with the previous guy who got confirmed, 13-12, thank you very much. We can all sit around and chalangalang and have a good time, knowing that he doesn’t meet the law, lawmakers who voted unanimately to construct the law. That’s the issue here. He doesn’t meet the law, pure and simple. Thank you.”

Senator Kokubun rose in support of the nomination and said:

“You know, with respect to all of the individuals who were named by the previous speaker as having tremendous knowledge about the native Hawaiian culture, I would certainly agree with him on all of those suggestions. As we know, the process, however, is that individuals are nominated by the Governor and submitted to us as her selection. And so, regardless of, I think, the list of extraordinary individuals that the previous speaker alluded to, I think those would have tremendous influence if they were nominated by the Governor. Now, I think what that points out to me is perhaps that we need to be a bit more specific in our nomination process, or perhaps in the selection process, to fill this role that has been included in our statute ‘that one member shall have substantial experience or expertise in traditional Hawaiian land usage and knowledge of cultural land practices.’

“I would also point out to our members that part of the Act, not just in the committee report, but part of the Act of the bill, Senate Bill 2929, C.D. 1, is that in section 3 it states: ‘This Act shall take effect upon its approval, and shall apply to the land use commission upon its next vacancy.’ Now if you’ll recall, this was done in 2006. I think the Governor approved the law in July of 2006, and hence the next set of nominees came forward to us in 2007; and included in that list of nominees we approved were Normand Lezy, an attorney; Kyle Chock, who is with PRP; and Vladimir Devens, who is an attorney also practicing here in Hawai‘i. So, the process in my mind was that the Governor, if she followed the law, would have picked one of those nominees to fulfill this role. In whatever the fumbling that went on with the Land Use Commission, they were not clear in who was the actual designee. At that time, Mr. Kanuha already sat on the Commission. So obviously, the way the law was constructed would indicate that he was not going to be considered to fill this role. So, in my opinion, I think a lot of the confusion comes at the administrative level with respect to who was named.

“I want to also point out that what’s important on the Land Use Commission is that each county should be represented, and I think that’s very important because as in the previous discussion, we all know how unique the different counties are. We all know how different land use issues affect the different counties in a different way. And so, I think it was smart on the part of the Legislature when they first adopted the Land Use Commission back in 1961, I believe, that they designated a representative from each island because it was important to have that kind of perspective. Now, Mr. Kanuha is the representative from the Big Island, and I think that would again

provide some good expertise on his part. If you'll look at his background, he has served in numerous ways with land use planning, both at the county level and the private sector. He also worked for Hamakua Sugar Company in terms of trying to determine the kuleana lands that were within their purview and also in North Kohala. So, his background is very diverse in land use and in planning, and I think that bodes well for the Commission in terms of its decisions, particularly in the integration of the planning hierarchies between the state and the counties.

"At the hearing he was asked specifically about one case called PASH (that's the acronym for Public Access Shoreline Hawai'i), which is something that was a landmark case on behalf of the Supreme Court; and it talked about access to the shoreline and it, in fact, set that up as a requirement for any kind of land use development. And that occurred on the Big Island in Kona, as a matter of fact. By relationship, there was also another Supreme Court decision in *Pele Defense Fund v. Paty*, who was the DLNR chief at that time, and that also expanded gathering rights for native Hawaiians; and in particular was a parcel called Wao Kele 'O Puna on the Big Island. These were all occurring at the time that Mr. Kanuha was involved in living and working on the Big Island. I'm not sure what his exact role or occupation was at that time, but if you're from the Big Island and these cases come up, these are very, very important for us to understand, and of course they have ramifications for all of Hawai'i.

"The other issue that he talked about at the hearing when asked about any knowledge or experience he had with cultural practices and traditional land use, he talked about the fact that there is a very significant navigational heiau on part of the lands that he manages now on behalf of a company in North Kohala, Surety Kohala, and that they have gone to great ends to provide that as a means for students to study navigation, to protect the area, to interpret the area so that it can be a resource for future generations. And I mention this only because I think just from an understanding of the cultural significance, not just of sites, but of practice and how it will impact future generations of learners, I think this is very, very important. And lastly, we learned about through our Legacy Lands Program that there was a very significant heiau called Kukuipahu in North Kohala that was purchased by the State and the Trust for Public Lands from Kohala Surety because this was again something that the company, through the leadership of Mr. Kanuha, felt that this was very, very important to future generations. This heiau in particular is significant because some of the petroglyphs found on the stones there actually go very far back.

"And so, you know, I think he does have knowledge. I'm not sure if he speaks the language. You know, I think if those questions were asked of him in the committee hearing, as would be appropriate, then he would have had the opportunity to respond, but they were not; and therefore, I think it's hard for us to imagine what he would have said or thought in expressing himself on those issues.

"So colleagues, all I'm saying is that I believe this gentleman can and will fulfill his role. I think we need to clarify the selection process with the administration, and I would ask that you all support him. Thank you."

Senator Hee rose in rebuttal and said:

"You know, if the previous speaker wishes to redo this nominee's confirmation, I'm all for it. I'm all for it. I'm all for sitting across from him and saying, 'Hiki au 'oe ke 'olelo kō ma kuahine 'olelo mae,' and see what he says to me. I'm all for it.

"You know, I didn't want to get into his votes as a planning commissioner because that's not at issue here. I disagree with his votes. He is the previous person reincarnated on his votes.

He is the guy who said to me that he believes state plans have a life span of ten years and county have a life span of five years. He said that. And he is the same guy on a motion to dismiss the petitioner on Turtle Bay 30 years later, dismissed the petition by Defend O'ahu Coalition to assert for a new EIS, who voted 'dismiss the petitioner.' What's up with that? What is up with that? Here's a guy who says state plans are worth 10 years and the same guy who voted to dismiss the petitioner after 30 years. Duh! I didn't want to get into that because he has every right to do that, regardless that I disagree, regardless that he got caught. His voting record speaks for itself. He is the previous person, only a younger version.

"The previous speaker talked about the law says 'a future appointment.' Yippie yi yo! So, the Governor never follow the law? I don't think so. She appointed the next person, and the executive director appointed this nominee. The law doesn't say, 'Oh, all of the ones that are sitting at the time of the construction of the law cannot be.' The law says, 'The next person; then you're going to appoint.' The next person came on, the appointment was made, and this is what he said to my question: 'What are you expert in besides being Hawaiian?' This was his answer: 'Besides being Hawaiian?' So I said to him, 'I do not mean to offend you. I'm interested why you are the Hawaiian expert, as opposed to Kyle Chock or, you know, someone else? I mean, what makes you the expert, you know, because obviously you know where my line of questioning is going?' And this is what he said: 'Right; I wasn't aware that I was the expert. I wasn't aware.' Well, whose fault is that? Our fault? Give him a pass because he wasn't aware? 'I didn't know if any one of us was designated.' Duh! Well, I said to him, 'Evidently, you're the designated Hawaiian expert,' and he said, 'Okay.' And I said, 'The law requires a Hawaiian expert on the Commission,' and he said, 'Okay.' And then I said, 'What are you expert in? Or is that designation misplaced?' And he said, 'In my situation, I think it's misplaced. I mean, I wasn't aware of it until now.'

"You know, there's plenty ways to answer that question. 'Mr. Chairman, I didn't know I was the expert, but I am expert in being Hawaiian. After all, I'm one blalah.' U ao no kanuha. Kanuha: the angry one. Kanuha. And it's easy. You don't have to be an expert. All you have to do is care about your people. That if the chairman says, 'What have you done as an expert on these decisions before your Commission?' He could have easily said, 'Well, on the ones in Kapolei or the ones at Waimānalo Dump or the ones at Nānākuli, I sought out the kupuna because that's what you do when you Hawaiian.' He didn't say that. He had no idea. And that's being Hawaiian. Kupu. Kupu: to feed. Feed. Kupu. Kupu. Kupu ana: the act of feeding. Kupuna: he or she that feeds. Kupuna. Kupuna. Real simple. Real simple, but too complicated for this nominee.

"He did talk about a navigational heiau. He did talk about Makali'i. What he said was, 'I work for a company,' I *work* for a company, 'that supported the Makali'i and we did this navigational heiau and we restored it.' He didn't talk about the value of restoration, and he was given every opportunity. You know, he works for a company that extends itself to Kohala. Lei i Kohala kānuku o nā kānaka: Kohala is the place where all kānaka come from. He didn't talk about that. So if he was the expert, why hide it? Give that blalah asking the questions the razzmatazz. Let the Committee know that: 'I didn't know I was the expert, but since I am the expert, let me tell you about being an expert.' That wasn't him. In fact it was, 'I'm not the expert.'

"And regardless that this Legislature may have meant the next, we already had the next and the next and the next, and the Commission appointed him after the next. Thank you."

Senator Hooser rose to speak in opposition to the nomination and indicated that he would be voting 'no' and also requested that written remarks in opposition to the measure be entered into the Journal and the Chair so ordered.¹

Senator Takamine rose in support of the nomination and said:

"I respect the Chair of the subject matter committee, and I respect the points that he has raised on the floor today. Yet, from what I understood in the discussion in caucus, as well as on the floor, it appears to me that there seems to be some question as to who is the appropriate designee of knowing the cultural practices and knowledge of land use in this matter. Because of what I feel are questions raised about that issue, I would like to share some information with my colleagues before their vote on Duane Kanuha, the nominee.

"I am personally familiar with the nominee because I have had a chance to work with him. As my Big Island colleague indicated, he is from the Big Island. Moreover, as indicated earlier in the discussion, he has served as head of the planning department and that gives a person some background and expertise.

"I would like to share information about his work, not in the public sector, but in the private sector while he was working for Hamakua Sugar, while he was working for Frannie Morgan. At that time, Frannie Morgan was going through that phase of Hamakua Sugar just before it closed its doors for the final time. There was a lot of effort made to see what plans, what steps could be taken to not only have Hamakua Sugar continue operating, but to preserve the jobs of over 600 sugar workers and what that meant to the families who lived along the Hamakua coastline. In the course of that work, I saw part of the character of this nominee, and I saw his ability to be sensitive to those kinds of considerations.

"Several years later, I had a further opportunity because while serving in the House, Kohala was part of my district; and what was earlier referred to as Chalon which then became Kohala Surety was where Duane Kanuha the nominee also found employment opportunities. I had a chance to work with him there because Chalon, as one of the largest landowners in the North Kohala area of the Big Island, engaged in a process with the North Kohala community to develop a community plan; and again I saw the leadership role that this nominee played in being sensitive to that kind of input, in being sensitive to those kinds of concerns.

"And therefore, while this part of Duane Kanuha may not be the part that many of my colleagues make their determination on this Governor's Message, I wanted at least to offer that as further information which did not come up during the public hearing, but is part of this nominee's background. Thank you."

Senator Kokubun rose in rebuttal and said:

"You know, I think there is lots of discussion going on, and rightfully so, about the designation process; and just for everyone's edification, I wanted to read from the committee report on Senate Bill No. 2929, which became this part of this law about having an individual with expertise in native Hawaiian culture and land use practices. The committee report, through the discussion at the hearing, did state that 'this process does not preclude the nomination of any individual with unique qualifications, such as substantial experience or expertise in traditional Hawaiian land uses or knowledge of cultural land practices. However, there are no individuals with these specific qualifications currently serving on the Commission and no requirement that there be anyone with such qualifications.' So, I think it goes back to the fact that Mr. Kanuha was sitting on the Commission at that time; that the onus of having the selection process fall on the Governor in terms of asking and

designating who was going to be their cultural expert I think is very clear based on the committee report. So I think Mr. Kanuha was being honest in his responses to the Chair with respect to his surprise that he was actually named based on the committee report and those practices. Thank you, Madam Chair."

Senator Hemmings rose in opposition to the nomination and said:

"Through it all in all of the discussion, one clear factor cannot be denied: We passed a law requiring a cultural practitioner. The Governor has not followed it. This nominee, by his own admission, is not a cultural practitioner. We have no choice but to vote 'no' in order to stay compliant with the law as it is written and, more importantly, with the moral integrity of this body to stay consistent with what we voted for. I urge my colleagues. This is not a political vote. This is not a vote against the Governor. This is not a vote certainly against the individual. This is a vote that goes to the very heart of the integrity of this body to stay consistent with the very laws we wrote and applied. It's come back to us. The Governor nominates. We give advice and consent. We ratify it to make it legal. The board is illegally constituted. This nominee, by his own admission, is not the cultural practitioner. Therefore, I find it incredible that anyone could consider or stand and rise and speak in defense of this nomination. I'll be voting 'no', and would like to ask for a Roll Call vote." (The Chair so ordered.)

Senator Sakamoto rose on a point of inquiry as follows:

"I guess when I read the Governor's message, it refers to 'in accordance with provisions of Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution.' I guess a question for somebody: In that message, in that provision of the constitution, is this specific slot for Mr. Kanuha that provision that people are talking about? Because if it is not, then it would seem that it is in compliance with the Governor's message rather than being that specific slot that much of the elocution has been about. But I'm not sure who would be able to clarify if indeed it's in compliance with the Governor's message versus who people think this person should be and it just so happens he has a Hawaiian last name. I don't think we're voting on nationality or ethnicity. I think we're voting on qualification per the message."

The Chair responded:

"Senator Sakamoto, to the extent that you've addressed that question to the Chair, I will say that that provision of the Constitution does not incorporate the provision that is being discussed."

Senator Sakamoto replied:

"If that's the case, Madam President, I shall be voting in favor of this nomination."

The motion was put by the Chair and, Roll Call vote having been requested, failed to carry on the following showing of Ayes and Noes:

Ayes, 9; Ayes with Reservations (Gabbard, Green, Taniguchi). Noes, 14 (Baker, Chun Oakland, English, Espero, Fukunaga, Galuteria, Hee, Hemmings, Hooser, Ige, Kidani, Kim, Slom, Tsutsui). Excused, 2 (Bunda, Ihara).

FINAL READING

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 17-10 (H.B. No. 2266, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 17-10 and H.B. No. 2266, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CORRECTIONS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

¹ Request withdrawn at later date

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 18-10 (H.B. No. 1987, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 18-10 and H.B. No. 1987, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO FIREWORKS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 19-10 (H.B. No. 1684, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 19-10 and H.B. No. 1684, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INVASIVE SPECIES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 20-10 (H.B. No. 2289, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 20-10 and H.B. No. 2289, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO GIFT CERTIFICATES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 21-10 (H.B. No. 2283, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 21-10 and H.B. No. 2283, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PUBLIC PROCUREMENT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 22-10 (H.B. No. 1863, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 22-10 and H.B. No. 1863, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PROSTITUTION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 23-10 (H.B. No. 1992, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 23-10 and H.B. No. 1992, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 24-10 (H.B. No. 2595, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 24-10 and H.B. No. 2595, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO GENERAL EXCISE TAX," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 25-10 (H.B. No. 1818, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 25-10 and H.B. No. 1818, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO COGNITIVE RESTRUCTURING," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 26-10 (H.B. No. 2288, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 26-10 and H.B. No. 2288, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PRIVATE TRANSFER FEES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 27-10 (H.B. No. 2497, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 27-10 and H.B. No. 2497, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE BONDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 28-10 (H.B. No. 2919, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 28-10 and H.B. No. 2919, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 29-10 (H.B. No. 2831, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 29-10 and H.B. No. 2831, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE NATURAL ENERGY LABORATORY OF HAWAII AUTHORITY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 30-10 (H.B. No. 1978, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 30-10 and H.B. No. 1978, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TOWING," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 31-10 (H.B. No. 2061, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 31-10 and H.B. No. 2061, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CHILDREN," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 32-10 (H.B. No. 869, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 32-10 and H.B. No. 869, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO RENTAL MOTOR VEHICLES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 33-10 (H.B. No. 2349, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 33-10 and H.B. No. 2349, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO VIOLENCE AGAINST HEALTH CARE PERSONNEL," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 34-10 (H.B. No. 2575, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 34-10 and H.B. No. 2575, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TRAUMA," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 35-10 (H.B. No. 2688, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 35-10 and H.B. No. 2688, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HEALTH," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 36-10 (H.B. No. 2450, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 36-10 and H.B. No. 2450, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO RENEWABLE ENERGY FACILITIES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 37-10 (H.B. No. 2725, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 37-10 and H.B. No. 2725, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ANIMALS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 38-10 (H.B. No. 2661, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 38-10 and H.B. No. 2661, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ANATOMICAL GIFTS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 39-10 (H.B. No. 2397, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 39-10 and H.B. No. 2397, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PRIMARY ELECTIONS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 40-10 (H.B. No. 1212, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 40-10 and H.B. No. 1212, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INFORMATION PRACTICES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 41-10 (H.B. No. 2644, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 41-10 and H.B. No. 2644, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO SOLID WASTE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 42-10 (H.B. No. 1665, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 42-10 and H.B. No. 1665, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HAWAIIAN FISHPONDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 43-10 (H.B. No. 2604, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 43-10 and H.B. No. 2604, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO COMMERCIAL DRIVER LICENSING," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 44-10 (H.B. No. 865, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 44-10 and H.B. No. 865, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 45-10 (H.B. No. 415, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 45-10 and H.B. No. 415, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 46-10 (H.B. No. 2692, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 46-10 and H.B. No. 2692, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO DISASTER PREPAREDNESS PLANNING," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 47-10 (H.B. No. 2505, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 47-10 and H.B. No. 2505, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE ACCESS HAWAII COMMITTEE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 48-10 (H.B. No. 2157, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 48-10 and H.B. No. 2157, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EXPANDED ADULT RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 49-10 (H.B. No. 979, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 49-10 and H.B. No. 979, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE ENVIRONMENT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 50-10 (H.B. No. 2084, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 50-10 and H.B. No. 2084, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE FEDERAL DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITAL FUNDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 63-10 (S.B. No. 2150, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 63-10 and S.B. No. 2150, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO APPELLATE JURISDICTION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 64-10 (S.B. No. 2257, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 64-10 and S.B. No. 2257, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ELECTRONIC WARRANT VOUCHERS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 65-10 (S.B. No. 2256, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 65-10 and S.B. No. 2256, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 66-10 (S.B. No. 2169, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 66-10 and S.B. No. 2169, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO SHARK FINS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 67-10 (S.B. No. 2020, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 67-10 and S.B. No. 2020, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO REAL PROPERTY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 68-10 (S.B. No. 2545, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 68-10 and S.B. No. 2545, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INTOXICATING LIQUOR," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 69-10 (S.B. No. 2646, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 69-10 and S.B. No. 2646, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HAWAII SURFING RESERVES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 70-10 (S.B. No. 633, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 70-10 and S.B. No. 633, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO WATER," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 71-10 (S.B. No. 1059, S.D. 2, H.D. 3, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 71-10 and S.B. No. 1059, S.D. 2, H.D. 3, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO FIREWORKS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 72-10 (S.B. No. 1105, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 72-10 and S.B. No. 1105, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS AND PROCEDURES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 73-10 (S.B. No. 2154, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 73-10 and S.B. No. 2154, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ADULT PROBATION RECORDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 74-10 (S.B. No. 2472, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 74-10 and S.B. No. 2472, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 75-10 (S.B. No. 2643, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 75-10 and S.B. No. 2643, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO GENERAL EXCISE TAX," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 76-10 (S.B. No. 2231, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 76-10 and S.B. No. 2231, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ELECTRIC VEHICLES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 77-10 (S.B. No. 2859, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 77-10 and S.B. No. 2859, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY LICENSING ACT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 78-10 (S.B. No. 2697, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 78-10 and S.B. No. 2697, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INSURANCE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 79-10 (S.B. No. 506, S.D. 1, H.D. 3, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 79-10 and S.B. No. 506, S.D. 1, H.D. 3, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PROCUREMENT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 80-10 (S.B. No. 2105, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 80-10 and S.B. No. 2105, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PARKING FOR DISABLED PERSONS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 81-10 (S.B. No. 2454, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 81-10 and S.B. No. 2454, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PUBLIC AGENCY MEETINGS AND RECORDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 82-10 (S.B. No. 2831, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 82-10 and S.B. No. 2831, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE PROCUREMENT CODE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 83-10 (S.B. No. 2919, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 83-10 and S.B. No. 2919, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE HAWAII STATE HOSPITAL," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 84-10 (S.B. No. 2937, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 84-10 and S.B. No. 2937, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INFORMATION PRACTICES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 85-10 (S.B. No. 2565, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 85-10 and S.B. No. 2565, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE HAWAII CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 86-10 (S.B. No. 2745, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 86-10 and S.B. No. 2745, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 87-10 (S.B. No. 1230, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 87-10 and S.B. No. 1230, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TAXATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 88-10 (S.B. No. 2897, S.D. 2, H.D. 3, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 88-10 and S.B. No. 2897, S.D. 2, H.D. 3, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HIGHWAY SAFETY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 89-10 (S.B. No. 2346, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 89-10 and S.B. No. 2346, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE HAWAII TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 90-10 (S.B. No. 466, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 90-10 and S.B. No. 466, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO POLLUTION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 91-10 (S.B. No. 532, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 91-10 and S.B. No. 532, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO LIMITING CIVIL LIABILITY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 92-10 (S.B. No. 2045, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 92-10 and S.B. No. 2045, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CRIME," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 93-10 (S.B. No. 2371, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 93-10 and S.B. No. 2371, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO LIMITED BENEFIT HEALTH INSURANCE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 94-10 (S.B. No. 2811, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 94-10 and S.B. No. 2811, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PHARMACIES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 95-10 (S.B. No. 2610, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 95-10 and S.B. No. 2610, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CONVEYANCE TAX," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 96-10 (S.B. No. 2806, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 96-10 and S.B. No. 2806, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE EMERGENCY AND BUDGET RESERVE FUND," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 97-10 (S.B. No. 930, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 97-10 and S.B. No. 930, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO VOLUNTEER MEDICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 98-10 (S.B. No. 2729, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 98-10 and S.B. No. 2729, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO IMMUNIZATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 99-10 (S.B. No. 2473, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 99-10 and S.B. No. 2473, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HOUSING," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 100-10 (S.B. No. 2220, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 100-10 and S.B. No. 2220, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION SITES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 101-10 (S.B. No. 2399, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 101-10 and S.B. No. 2399, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO MIXED MARTIAL ARTS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 102-10 (S.B. No. 2601, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 102-10 and S.B. No. 2601, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled:

"A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ATHLETIC TRAINERS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 103-10 S.B. No. 2842, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 103-10 and S.B. No. 2842, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE PERMITTED TRANSFERS IN TRUST ACT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 104-10 (S.B. No. 2116, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 104-10 and S.B. No. 2116, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INDEMNIFICATION OF COUNTY AGENCIES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 105-10 (S.B. No. 1062, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 105-10 and S.B. No. 1062, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 106-10 (S.B. No. 2883, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 106-10 and S.B. No. 2883, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 107-10 (S.B. No. 910, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 107-10 and S.B. No. 910, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE TRANSFER OF HOMELESS PROGRAMS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 108-10 (S.B. No. 2165, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 108-10 and S.B. No. 2165, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PRIVATE GUARDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 109-10 (S.B. No. 2563, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 109-10 and S.B. No. 2563, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ENERGY EFFICIENCY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 110-10 (S.B. No. 2599, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 110-10 and S.B. No. 2599, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HEALTH INSURANCE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 111-10 (S.B. No. 2702, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 111-10 and S.B. No. 2702, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled:

"A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO A MAJOR DISASTER TRUST ACCOUNT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 112-10 (S.B. No. 2716, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 112-10 and S.B. No. 2716, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CHILD PROTECTIVE ACT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 113-10 (S.B. No. 2825, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 113-10 and S.B. No. 2825, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO STATE FUNDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 114-10 (S.B. No. 2828, S.D. 1, H.D. 3, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 114-10 and S.B. No. 2828, S.D. 1, H.D. 3, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EDUCATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 115-10 (S.B. No. 2324, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 115-10 and S.B. No. 2324, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 116-10 (S.B. No. 2691, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 116-10 and S.B. No. 2691, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM BENEFITS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 117-10 (S.B. No. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 117-10 and S.B. No. 2054, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CIVIL DEFENSE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 118-10 (S.B. No. 2386, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 118-10 and S.B. No. 2386, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM PROJECT ASSESSMENT SPECIAL FUND," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 119-10 (S.B. No. 2400, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 119-10 and S.B. No. 2400, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO FUNDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 120-10 (S.B. No. 2603, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 120-10 and S.B. No. 2603, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled:

"A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE SECURE AND FAIR ENFORCEMENT FOR MORTGAGE LICENSING ACT," was until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 121-10 (S.B. No. 2661, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 121-10 and S.B. No. 2661, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE, ITS OFFICERS, OR ITS EMPLOYEES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 122-10 (S.B. No. 2809, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 122-10 and S.B. No. 2809, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO UTILITIES REGULATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 123-10 (S.B. No. 2395, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 123-10 and S.B. No. 2395, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE BUDGET," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 124-10 (S.B. No. 2461, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 124-10 and S.B. No. 2461, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 125-10 (S.B. No. 2548, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 125-10 and S.B. No. 2548, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 126-10 (S.B. No. 2534, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 126-10 and S.B. No. 2534, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO BAIL," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 127-10 (S.B. No. 2385, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 127-10 and S.B. No. 2385, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 128-10 (S.B. No. 2068, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 128-10 and S.B. No. 2068, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EARLY EDUCATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 129-10 (S.B. No. 2115, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 129-10 and S.B. No. 2115, S.D. 1, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PREAUDITS FOR

PROPOSED PAYMENTS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 130-10 (S.B. No. 2434, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 130-10 and S.B. No. 2434, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO SALARIES," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 131-10 (S.B. No. 2885, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 131-10 and S.B. No. 2885, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 132-10 (S.B. No. 2491, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 132-10 and S.B. No. 2491, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TELEMEDICINE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 133-10 (S.B. No. 2951, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 133-10 and S.B. No. 2951, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO AGRICULTURE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 134-10 (S.B. No. 2600, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 134-10 and S.B. No. 2600, S.D. 2, H.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO HEALTHCARE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 135-10 (S.B. No. 2173, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 135-10 and S.B. No. 2173, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO STATE BONDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 136-10 (H.B. No. 2775, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 136-10 and H.B. No. 2775, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO AGRICULTURE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 137-10 (H.B. No. 2503, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 137-10 and H.B. No. 2503, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE ENVIRONMENT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 138-10 (H.B. No. 2832, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 138-10 and H.B. No. 2832, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TARO SECURITY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 139-10 (H.B. No. 1948, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 139-10 and H.B. No. 1948, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TAXATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 140-10 (H.B. No. 2594, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 140-10 and H.B. No. 2594, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO CONFORMITY OF THE HAWAII INCOME TAX LAW TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 141-10 (H.B. No. 2583, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 141-10 and H.B. No. 2583, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO IMPOUNDED VESSELS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 142-10 (H.B. No. 2845, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 142-10 and H.B. No. 2845, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO LANDS CONTROLLED BY THE STATE," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 143-10 (H.B. No. 2441, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 143-10 and H.B. No. 2441, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PROCUREMENT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 144-10 (H.B. No. 2133, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 144-10 and H.B. No. 2133, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO PROCUREMENT," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 145-10 (H.B. No. 1808, H.D. 3, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 14-10 and H.B. No. 1808, H.D. 3, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO COASTAL AREAS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 146-10 (H.B. No. 347, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 14-10 and H.B. No. 347, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 147-10 (H.B. No. 2486, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 147-10 and H.B. No. 2486, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EDUCATION," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 148-10 (H.B. No. 2542, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 14-10 and H.B. No. 2542, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO NON-GENERAL FUNDS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 149-10 (H.B. No. 2318, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 149-10 and H.B. No. 2318, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE HOMELESS," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 150-10 (H.B. No. 2000, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 150-10 and H.B. No. 2000, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 151-10 (H.B. No. 2200, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 151-10 and H.B. No. 2200, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE STATE BUDGET," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 152-10 (H.B. No. 2698, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 152-10 and H.B. No. 2698, H.D. 2, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO TECHNOLOGY," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

Conf. Com. Rep. No. 153-10 (S.B. No. 2849, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1):

By unanimous consent, action on Conf. Com. Rep. No. 15-10 and S.B. No. 2849, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, C.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE HAWAII EMPLOYER-UNION HEALTH BENEFITS TRUST FUND," was deferred until Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

RECONSIDERATION OF ACTIONS TAKEN

S.B. No. 2172 S.D. 2 (H.D. 1):

Senator Sakamoto moved that the Senate reconsider its action taken on April 8, 2010, in disagreeing to the amendments proposed by the House to S.B. No. 2172, S.D. 2, seconded by Senator Kim and carried.

Senator Sakamoto then moved that the Senate agree to amendments proposed by the House to S.B. No. 2172, S.D. 2, seconded by Senator Kim.

Senator Sakamoto noted:

"The House version has corrected the date, so it's an effective date."

The motion was then put by the Chair and carried, the Senate agreed to the amendments proposed by the House to S.B. No. 2172, S.D. 2, and S.B. No. 2172, S.D. 2, H.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE BONDS TO ASSIST KAIMUKI CHRISTIAN SCHOOL," was placed on the calendar for Final Reading on Tuesday, April 27, 2010.

At this time, the Chair made the following announcements:

“Conferees will be named in accordance with the Action Sheets to be distributed to your offices later this afternoon.

“Re-referrals may be made in accordance with the Supplemental Order of the Day to be distributed to your offices later this afternoon.

“Requests to place bills on the Ordinary Calendar for tomorrow’s agenda should be submitted to the Senate Clerk’s office no later than 4:00 p.m. today.”

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

H.C.R. No. 284 (S.D. 1):

In accordance with the disagreement of the House to the amendments proposed by the Senate to H.C.R. No. 284, and the request for a conference on the subject matter thereof, the President appointed Senators Fukunaga, chair; Ige, Slom as managers on the part of the Senate at such conference.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11:01 a.m., on motion by Senator Sakamoto, seconded by Senator Slom and carried, the Senate adjourned until 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, April 27, 2010.