The Judiciary, State of Hawaii

Testimony to the House Committee on Human Services
Representative Dee Morikawa, Chair
Representative Bertrand Kobayashi, Vice Chair

Tuesday, February 2, 2016, 9:00 a.m.
State Capitol, Conference Room 329

by
R. Mark Browning
Senior Judge, Deputy Chief Judge
Family Court of the First Circuit

Bill No. and Title: House Bill No. 1701, Relating to Family Courts

Judiciary's Position:

The Judiciary strongly opposes House Bill No. 1701, Relating to Family Courts.

At page 5, from line 15, this bill purports to set forth a mandatory evidentiary hearing as follows:

> (9) In every proceeding where there is at issue a dispute as to the custody of a child[~~,~~] or visitation by a parent, if the case involves allegations or a history of family violence, the court shall first hold an evidentiary hearing that shall be limited to evidence related to the issue of family violence.

This provision of a mandatory evidentiary hearing will act as a costly and potentially dangerous straightjacket for the parties (especially the victims) as well as the judicial and social systems involved with the parties. This provision, in the context of the other changes proposed by this bill, will produce untenable results, additional costs to parties, and increased burdens on the victims and children of the violence. Requiring an evidentiary hearing in every target proceeding will also cause delays in the judicial process; thereby, delaying appropriate relief to the parties and their families. Additional judicial resources will be required and such resources will have to be funded.

Here are our specific concerns:

1. This requirement will apply to divorces, paternities, protective orders, and other types of cases and will affect a large number of cases. Unfortunately, the problem of domestic violence is widespread. Rather than representing a small percentage of cases, the court is confronted with domestic violence allegations on a daily basis.

2. The requirement that the "court shall ***first*** hold an evidentiary hearing . . ." is problematic. This implies that the court will be setting cases on its own volition. It is a long established policy of this country's judicial system that the court generally does not respond absent case or controversy. This allows the parties to decide what needs to be brought to court. This discretion is taken away by this requirement.

3. The requirement that the "court shall first hold an ***evidentiary*** hearing that shall be limited to evidence related to the issue of family violence" is problematic. First of all, the timing of the hearing, i.e., "first," implies "early in the case" or "soon after filing." These means that the parties have yet to conduct discovery or to get their own evidence in order before they must participate in such a hearing. Requiring a hearing before the parties are ready generally leads to incomplete decision making and/or errors.

4. The requirement that the "court shall first hold an evidentiary hearing that shall be ***limited*** to evidence related to the issue of family violence" is problematic. This is possible if the issues of the case are very limited. However, in custody/visitation cases, the facts and issues are often not limited. Certainly, the effect of family violence when children are involved is complex. This provision appears to envision a simple hearing that might be limited to "she said/he said." However, in the context of custody/visitation issues, the burden and the need to go beyond "she said/he said" are greater, as are the consequences of hasty decision making.

5. The application of the policies of issue and fact preclusion may have to be suspended. These policies basically apply to allow just "one bite at the apple." In other words, if a fact or an issue is established/ruled upon after a full litigated hearing, the parties cannot come back to the trial court and try to re-do the hearing. If the parties are not satisfied, their recourse is to file an appeal. However, it would be fundamentally unfair to first require a hearing early in the proceedings limited to one issue and then to apply issue and fact

preclusion to the outcome of that hearing. In the end, all contested issues and facts will have to be re-litigated, including the ones covered at that "first" hearing.

6. A fundamental problem, in addition to the practical problems of cost, delay, and procedural unfairness, is this bill's nullification of the rebuttable presumption that the Legislature enacted to aid victims of family violence in recognition of the imbalance of power and resources between aggressors and victims. The mandatory evidentiary hearing requirement thwarts the impact of the presumption.

7. The new provision at page 7, beginning at line 8 states: "(iv) A parent's allegation of family violence, if made in good faith, shall not be a factor that weighs against the parent in determining custody or visitation;". This provision automatically creates a new area of litigation, *i.e.*, the intent of the party alleging family violence. This will be a trap and a cost for victims. For example, even if the court finds that the allegations are true, there can still be litigation about whether or not said allegations were made in good faith. Truth and good faith may not be congruent.

Page 1 of the bill requires mandatory training of judges and "relevant professional personnel" in "domestic violence advocacy" at least every three years. This provision is not appropriate and it is not necessary. The Judiciary must operate with strict neutrality and fairness. We must also avoid even the *appearance* of impropriety. It would be inappropriate to require the Judiciary to conduct training about advocacy of *any* subject. In contrast, for the past several years, family court judges have participated in annual training regarding best practices in the area of domestic violence, intimate partner violence, and the effect of such violence on children. The training topics were not designed to instill any sense of "advocacy" on behalf of the judges or court staff.

In our testimony for SCR 51 last year, we noted the extensive training that the Family Court judges have had and gave examples of the trainings held in the past 5 years. Here is the relevant excerpt from that testimony with an accompanying table submitted to the 2015 Legislature.

"Furthermore, the Family Court is committed to judicial training. Nationally, Family Courts and Juvenile Courts have long been viewed as courts with specially trained judges. Such special training promotes better understanding of certain areas such as child abuse, divorce, and family/domestic violence. In addition to training provided to all judges by the Judiciary, the Family Court judges of all the circuits also attend an annual Family Court Symposium.

Family/domestic violence is a major topic that is regularly presented in addition to other matters and topics. For example, in the last five years, the judges have received training on the following family/domestic violence subjects:"

Year	Topic	Speaker(s)
2010	Accounting for Domestic Violence in Child Custody Cases: • Victim & Perpetrator Behavior • Implications for Parenting • Custody & Visitation: Getting the Right Information Crafting Plans: Best Interests of the Child	National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ)
2011	Domestic Violence and Child Welfare	National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
2012	Child Witness in Domestic Violence, CPS, & Divorce Cases	National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
2013	Context for Understanding Trauma in Victims of Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Responding to Trauma in Victims of Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault	Olga Trujillo, J.D. Danielle Pugh-Markie Honorable Tamona Gonzalez Olga Trujillo, J.D. Danielle Pugh-Markie Honorable Tamona Gonzalez
2014	Intimate Partner Violence & Trauma • Examining the Impact from the Inside Out • Connecting the Neurobiology of Trauma • Victim Behavior & Assessing Credibility • What You Can Do to Help	Olga Trujillo, J.D.

The court takes no position and have no comments on the provisions of the bill concerning child custody evaluators beginning at page 12, from line 10.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this matter.

DENNIS "FRESH" ONISHI
Council Member
District 3

PHONE: (808) 961-8396
FAX: (808) 961-8912
EMAIL: *donishi@hawaiicounty.gov*

HAWAIʻI COUNTY COUNCIL

County of Hawaiʻi
25 Aupuni Street
Hilo, Hawaiʻi 96720

TESIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE BILL NO. 1701

A BILL FOR AN ACT
RELATING TO FAMILY COURTS

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES
Rep. Dee Morikawa, Chair
Rep. Bertrand Kobayashi, Vice Chair

Tuesday, February 2, 2016, 9:00 a.m.
State Capitol, Conference Room 329

Honorable Chair Morikawa,
Vice Chair Kobayashi,
And Members of the Committee on Judiciary

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in support of H.B. No. 1851, relating to the Public Utilities Commission.

I agree with the purpose of this bill which is to ensure that all areas of the state are represented in the commission by requiring one of the three commissioners to be from a county other than the city and county of Honolulu. Furthermore, allowing a commissioner to participate by teleconference or videoconference

Please recommend approval of this bill.

Edward Thompson, III

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2016 3:45 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: mrocca@hscadv.org
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/27/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Michelle Rocca	Hawaii State Coalition Against Domestic Violence	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Denby Toci
Community Advocate Against Domestic Violence/
Family Violence Interagency Committee Member-Hilo

TESTIMONY FOR HOUSE BILL 1701

A BILL RELATING TO HAWAII'S SAFE CHILD ACT

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES
Rep. Dee Morikawa, Chair
Rep. Bertrand Kobayashi, Vice Chair

Tuesday, February 2nd at 9:00am in State Capitol Room 329

As a former victim of domestic violence and now an advocate against DV, I am submitting my testimony **in favor of HOUSE BILL 1701**.

Children witnessing and first had experiencing abuse by a parent unable to control their anger, frustrations, having poor parental skills are a detriment to the child's well being. I raised four children in an abusive household until I was strong enough to leave. The three oldest were greatly affected as they were older in age, pre-teens, residing in the abusive home much longer than they should have. The younger child didn't have much memory of violence although he had a firsthand encounter of it.
It isn't mentally, spiritually and emotionally safe for any child/ren to have engagement with the "scary" parent, unless proper intervention supports the family. Deciding child custody will have to factor in ongoing/history of domestic violence. No child should be placed with the parent they are not safe with. Visitations should not occur until proper intervention of treatment for all members of the family has proven it safe for the child to have interactions with the (former) abusive parent.

Please accept my testimony **in favor of House Bill 1701**. Thank you.

Chair Morikawa, Vice Chair Kobayashi and Members of the Committee on Human Services,

It is an honor to testify before the Human Services committee of the Hawaii legislature to support House Bill 1701, the Safe Child Act.

The Stop Abuse Campaign works to protect children from ten specific traumas so significant that the Centers for Disease Control has identified them as causing permanent, life-long harm. These Adverse Childhood Experiences, as they are called, have a significant impact on our society's health. Court professionals cannot protect children if they don't understand the research proving that exposure to these traumas is far more consequential than previously realized, or if they rely on the equivalent of general practitioners who do not have the expertise to recognize domestic violence.

The Safe Child Act protects children by ensuring court staff use current scientific research in standard court practices, and by encouraging the use of a more multi-disciplinary approach that includes using experts who are better able to recognize domestic violence and child abuse. Family courts are sometimes places where children who have experienced trauma rely on the court's knowledge and belief systems to protect them from more. As it stands, sometimes this works and sometimes it doesn't. The Safe Child Act will ensure the most vulnerable of children will be protected under the worst circumstances.

HB1701 will make Hawaii the first state in the nation to ensure evidence-based best practices are used to protect children in family court. Only a very small percent of children in family court need protecting, but the ones that do tend to fall through the many safety nets with disastrous consequences.

Passing HB1701 will ensure that the frontline experts that Hawaii already has available are used to inform decisions that will affect a child's entire future. In doing so, it will reduce the number of times the divorcing parents need to appear in court, saving time and money AND it will spare Hawaii's children from dangerous, debunked pseudoscience that sentences children to lives of horror and loss.

Many good-intentioned policies and opinions about handling cases concerning children and divorce were designed before we had any science to support them. For good or bad, they became accepted and entrenched, and some of them hurt children. The world didn't have empirical evidence that childhood trauma harms children throughout their lives until the late 1990's. The Safe Child Act ensures a new wellspring of knowledge and best practices that will replace some professional "bad habits" that we now know harm children.

People flock to Hawaii from all over the world because they believe it's Paradise on Earth. Of course, it's adults who buy plane tickets, make hotel reservations and plan vacations. To a small child, Paradise is as simple as a safe home with someone who loves him/her. Every child deserves that. Every public servant should consider it their privilege, more than their job, to help each child have that. By ensuring that Hawaii's children are protected in family court proceedings by passing HB1701, you ensure that Hawaii remains a paradise for its youngest citizens. And by protecting the vulnerable from trauma, you reduce the chances of them using and succumbing to drugs, becoming criminals, suffering from a host of chronic illnesses, and a host of other expensive and unnecessary maladies.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I urge you to make Hawaii, and the rest of the country by your example, a better place for adults by protecting children.

FAMILY LAW SECTION
OF THE
HAWAII STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

737 Bishop Street Suite 1450
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
www.hawaiifamilylawsection.org

February 1, 2016

TO: Representative Dee Morikawa, Chair
Representative Bertrand Kobayashi, Vice-Chair
House Committee on Human Services

FROM: Dyan K Mitsuyama, Chair
Family Law Section of the Hawaii State Bar Association
E-Mail: dyan@mitsuyamaandrebman.com
Phone: 545-7035

HEARING DATE: February 1, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

RE: Testimony in Opposition to HB1701 Relating to Family Courts

---

Dear Chairwoman Morikawa & Vice Chair Kobayashi and fellow committee members:

I am Dyan K. Mitsuyama, a partner in Mitsuyama & Rebman, LLLC, which is a law firm concentrating in all family law matters. I have been a licensed attorney here in the State of Hawaii for about 17 years.

I submit testimony today in opposition to HB 1701 on behalf of the Family Law Section of the Hawaii State Bar Association, which is comprised of approximately 143 licensed attorneys state-wide all practicing or expressing an interest in practicing family law.

I also submit this testimony with an extensive background in advocating for domestic violence victims. In the past, I have been employed with the Domestic Violence Clearinghouse and Legal Hotline, now known as Domestic Violence Action Center (DVAC) both as an employee and an independent contractor.

So while HB 1701 has good intentions overall, I believe it is unnecessary and can create more backlog in the Family Court system which in turn will actually hurt domestic violence victims more than help them.

As such, we oppose HB 1701 for the following reasons:

1. Re: Mandatory ongoing training in domestic violence advocacy. Requiring Judges and court personnel to attend training is not the issue here. The issue is the luxury of time and the cost to attend. First, the Judges have court proceedings Monday through Friday generally from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. This is separate and apart from the preparation needed before the actual courtroom opens. Requiring Judges and court personnel to attend mandatory trainings would create backlog in the court. In addition, this requirement may prove to be too expensive for the State to bear. Quite honestly, in my experience, the Family Court judges are always in search of training or education, but it does not have the funds to pay for such trainings. When there is any "free" opportunity for the Judges to attend trainings or seminars the Judges are eager and more than willing to attend. The "free" sessions though are rare and the Court has to also ensure for the public that there are personnel in the Courts at the same time.

2. Re: A hearing only on evidence relating to family violence. HRS Section 571-46 provides the standards, considerations, and procedures that the Court must follow in awarding custody and/or visitation. There are several considerations in cases that involve family violence. It is no secret that the Court is overcrowded. There are too many cases and not enough Judges or court personnel. Victims now wait for hearings for weeks, sometimes for a few months. Creating another layer by requiring a hearing on "just the issue of family violence" will establish further backlog. Victims who are in need of financial assistance or shelter or protections for their children cannot wait for the Court now, much less wait that much longer because a hearing will be required just on the issue of family violence first then have another hearing afterward on the issue of temporary child support or alimony. This would be extremely time-consuming for the general public who will need to take off more time from work if multiple hearings are required.

   Again, is this necessary? No.

3. Re: Custody Evaluators having specific knowledge and training regarding family violence, sexual abuse, or mental health. First, it is unclear if this proposed change is now requiring the appointment of a Custody Evaluator in all family violence cases. If this is so, again this is cost-prohibitive. Custody Evaluators qualified under HRS 571-46.4 range from $3,500-$10,000. Moreover, at least half of the handful of individuals on the Court-registered list are from the mainland often making their availability difficulty and even more expensive.

   The reality is that this additional language is unnecessary. The statute currently requires Custody Evaluators to have the education and training that meet nationally recognized competencies and standards of practice in child custody evaluation. These nationally recognized competencies, particularly the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts Model Standards of Practice for Child Custody Evaluation and the American Psychologists Association's Guidelines For Child Custody Evaluations already provide that practitioners who conduct child custody evaluations should gain and maintain specialized competence in all issues that may come up, but specifically domestic violence.

   The additional proposed language is duplicative.

Thank you for your time.

NOTE: ***The comments and recommendations submitted reflect the position/viewpoint of the Family Law Section of the HSBA. The position/viewpoint has not been reviewed or approved by the HSBA Board of Directors, and is not being endorsed by the Hawaii State Bar Association.***

FARRELL & ASSOCIATES
Family Law Attorneys
A Limited Liability Law Company

Thomas D. Farrell
Certified Specialist in Family Law*
tom@farrell-hawaii.com
Anthony A. Perrault
tony@farrell-hawaii.com
J. Alberto Montalbano
juan@farrell-hawaii.com
Leslie Ching Allen
leslie@farrell-hawaii.com

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS D. FARRELL
Regarding House Bill 1701 Relating to Family Courts
and House Bill 1694 Relating to the Judiciary Child and Spouse Abuse Special Account

Committee on Human Services
Rep. Dee Morikawa, Chair

Tuesday, February 2, 2016, 9:00 a.m.
Conference Room 329, State Capitol

Good morning Representative Morikawa and members of the Committee:

HB 1701 should logically be addressed first, because HB1694 is primarily a measure to finance one of its provisions. I oppose both.

HB 1701would require family court to first hold an evidentiary hearing on the issue of family violence whenever that claim is raised in order to determine---if the judge can---whether family violence actually occurred. Typically, in divorce and paternity cases, claims of family violence are raised in the context of contested child custody, but the motions raising those claims often include other claims such as temporary use of a residence or vehicle, temporary support orders, and other financial issues. If the intent of this proviso is to require two separate hearings on motions of this type, this will clog up an already overburdened court, and drive up the cost of legal services for the litigants who will now have to pay their lawyers for two hearings. If the intent of this proviso is not to require two separate hearings, then I fail to see the point of it. By the way, if someone really wants a quick determination on family violence, one need only file a *Petition for Protection* under Chapter 586, and generally there will be a hearing on that petition in a very short time and a determination of whether "abuse," as that term is statutorily defined, has occurred. Most child custody litigants know this, which may explain why the vast majority of contested child cases involve the filing of a Chapter 586 petition, first.

Another proviso of the bill requires child custody evaluators to have qualifications relevant to the subject of family violence. I have previously advocated the repeal of the family court's authority to appoint custody evaluators. I won't revisit that argument today, although if they are the family court's appointees, it seems to me that it is the province of the judicial branch, and not you, to determine what training and qualifications they must possess.

Yet another proviso of the bill says that if the proceeding does not involve mental health issues, a person will not be disqualified for appointment as a child custody evaluator solely because the person does not hold a degree relating to mental health. I was not aware that this was a problem

*Certified by the National Board of Trial Advocacy. The Supreme Court of Hawaii grants Hawaii certification only to lawyers in good standing who have successfully completed a specialty program accredited by the American Bar Association.

crying out for a solution. Current law permits Licensed Clinical Social Workers to serve as custody evaluators, as well as any other person who meets "nationally recognized competencies and standards of practice in child custody evaluations." A change in the law is not needed.

Still another provision prohibits use of a parent's good faith allegation of family violence as a factor that weighs against the parent in determining child custody or visitation. If it is truly made "in good faith," I can't imagine that it would. Similarly, a bad faith allegation should assuredly be a negative factor for someone seeking custody. However, there are substantial protections in Section 571-46, HAW. REV. STAT. that require the court to find, "by clear and convincing evidence," that there has been "willful misuse" of the protection from abuse process, and further require the court to articulate express findings on that issue before considering a false allegation in an award of custody. Once again, this is a problem that doesn't need fixing.

Finally, the bill would require family court judges and professional personnel to complete ongoing training in the latest "best practices and research in domestic violence advocacy." First of all, judges are not supposed to be advocates for anybody; they are supposed to be neutral and impartial. Second, I believe the premise is flawed Section one of HB 1694 states that judges are often unable to determine the validity of domestic violence claims, and posits that the answer is more training. In court, a determination as to whether one party committed domestic violence---a determination that can have devastating consequences---is based on evidence. You don't need to train the judge to have preconceived notions. Moreover, our family court judges already participate in training on domestic violence---you can ask Judge Browning more about that. I can tell you it is a recurring topic at the Family Law Section of the Bar, and our judges often participate with us, in addition to whatever in-house training that the judiciary does. I believe it is highly inappropriate for the legislative branch to micromanage the judicial branch in this manner. A healthy respect for the separation of powers doctrine would not be amiss here. Finally, I am concerned that this could be misused by groups who have their own unique agendas and philosophy regarding domestic violence as a vehicle to try to indoctrinate judges in their particular point of view, particularly in light of HB 1694. Domestic violence is repulsive, but it deserves dispassionate analysis, not propaganda.

Now as for House Bill 1694, that would set aside $2 from marriage license fees to make sure the Judiciary can pay for training that you are going to mandate in HB 1701. However, that money must go to "trainers who have hands-on experience in the field." I wonder who that would be. Could this be a funding grab by certain non-profits? Well, in my law firm we have plenty of experience in domestic violence, although I'm not sure what the author means by "hands on." So if you pass this, perhaps I'll form DVEC---The Domestic Violence Education Center---so I can get in on the action.

Both of these bills should be held in this Committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning.

Edward Thompson, III

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2016 6:48 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: edwardschline@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/27/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Edward Schline	Individual	Support	No

Comments: I support this bill because it will save money and help children.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Edward Thompson, III

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 3:05 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: jameslogue412@gmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/28/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
James Logue	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

T0: The Hawai'i State House of Representatives Committee on Human Services
Re: HB 1701

To: The Honorable Representative Morikawa and the members of the committee.

Aloha.

My name is Larmont Andre Giles. I am a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, and I strongly support HB 1701 that requires family court judges complete ongoing training in the latest best practices in domestic violence advocacy. Domestic violence stealthily unleashes incomprehensible and demoralizing misery onto the most vulnerable and defenseless members of our society (blameless children). As members of our communities, we should individually and collectively express our outrage concerning this social epidemic. By ignoring the inherent dangers of domestic violence that incontrovertibly permeates the fabric of our lives, we become complicit in the criminal offense. We all know someone who has been a victim, perpetrator or bystander of intimate partner violence (IPV). IPV is a harmful, complex, and elusive interaction among persons of known, frequent and/or infrequent intimate contact. It can happen along a continuum, from a single episodes of violence, to ongoing battering. Violent episodes are triggered by both men and women. Therefore, I agree with the prohibition of simple parental good faith allegations of DV. Because of the complex nature of IPV, it is paramount that family court judges, and professional personnel complete ongoing training in the latest best practices and research in domestic violence advocacy. By passing this bill, you will be putting into place a decent and honorable mechanisms to ameliorate some of the harm inflicted upon some of the most vulnerable members of our society.

Mahalo
Larmont Andre Giles

Edward Thompson, III

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2016 3:28 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: jusbecuz@hotmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/27/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Marilyn Yamamoto	Individual	Support	No

Comments: There has been controversy over domestic violence and its treatment in the family courts for decades. Men blame women for most of the false allegations and women blame men for the same. It is imperative that there be attention paid to discovery of the truth before custody is decided. This bill needs to pass.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 11:11 AM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: alessiurr@hotmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/29/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Alessia Owen	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Hawaii Safe Child Act HB 1701

Good Morning Chair Morikawa, Vice Chair Kobayashi and House Human Services Committee Members,

My name is Barry Goldstein. I have worked in the domestic violence movement for 33 years and wrote some of the leading books about domestic violence and custody, particularly books for professionals based on the most current scientific research. I am also the research director for the Stop Abuse Campaign. I appreciate your consideration of HB1701, the Safe Child Act, which will protect children in Family Court.

I would like to share with you why I first created this proposal in the hope that you will support HB1701 and make it the law for Hawaii's children. The custody courts developed their practices in the 1970s, when there was no research and many popular beliefs assumed domestic violence (DV) was caused by mental illness or substance abuse. Although we now have substantial research that could help judges better protect children, courts have been slow to adopt reforms based on current research.

I have seen all too many preventable tragedies across the country, including Hawaii. When a battered mother or her children are murdered by an abuser using custody issues to gain access, it is easy to see that something went wrong. More often, children are sent to live with abusers and effectively silenced. When they commit suicide several years later or die from a drug overdose, no one wants to make the connection to the custody decision. I have spoken to many young adults who aged out of custody orders, and the pain and suffering they continue to endure is unspeakable. Without fail, they are angrier with the professionals who had a chance to save them than they are at anyone else, even their abusers.

The statistics tell the horrific story. Every year 58,000 children are sent for custody or unprotected visitation with dangerous abusers. In a recent two-year period researchers found stories about 175 children who were murdered by fathers involved in contested custody cases (two in Hawaii). Although deliberate false reports of abuse by mothers occur less than 2% of the time in child sexual abuse cases the alleged offender wins custody 85% of the time. As painful as these statistics are, the survivors' stories are so much worse.

Hope for Protecting Our Children

Two recent studies from very credible sources can protect children in domestic violence custody cases and provide wonderful improvements to our society. The ACE (Adverse Childhood Experiences) Studies are medical research that initially was used by doctors to diagnose and treat patients. Dr. Vincent Felitti, the lead author of the original ACE Study, believes that prevention is the best use for his research.

The ACE research proves children exposed to domestic violence and child abuse will live shorter lives and suffer more illness and injuries as adults. Domestic abusers use coercive and controlling tactics to scare their victims into doing what the abuser wants. Living in or with such fear, that the direct victim and the children have no way to control, causes the worst kind of stress that leads to a lifetime of misery.

While the ACE Research demonstrates that DV and child abuse are much more damaging than previously realized, the Saunders' Study explains why court professionals without the specific specialized training needed to understand DV so frequently disbelieve or minimize true reports of abuse. The Saunders' Study, from the

National Institute of Justice in the US Justice Department, found that judges, lawyers and evaluators need specific training in screening for DV, risk assessment, post-separation violence and the impact of DV on children (the ACE research). Professionals without this knowledge tend to focus on the myth that mothers often make false reports and unscientific alienation theories. These mistaken beliefs inevitably lead to outcomes that harm children.

The Safe Child Act for Hawaii

I co-edited an important book with Dr. Mo Therese Hannah entitled *Domestic Violence, Abuse and Child Custody*. It contains chapters by over 25 of the leading experts in the US and Canada including judges, lawyers, psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, journalists and DV advocates. We hoped that by putting all the important research together in one volume it would help the courts respond better to DV. We had similar hopes when the Saunders' Study was released and the ACE Research started being used beyond the medical community. But the custody courts have been slow to integrate this important research into its standard practices. That is why I included a provision in the Safe Child Act to require courts to consider current research that will help courts protect children.

The Saunders' study demonstrates the need for a more multi-disciplinary approach. Domestic Violence is not caused by mental illness and children respond in many different ways to abuse, including outward appearances that they are doing well. This has led many evaluators to disbelieve true reports of abuse. Psychologists and psychiatrists can be very helpful when custody issues involve psychology or mental

illness, but often courts need expertise in child sexual abuse, medical issues, substance abuse or DV.

The Safe Child Act, in the form of HB1701, encourages court professionals to receive more of the specific training they need, but also encourages the use of specialized experts who can help courts recognize and respond to DV and related issues. An early hearing regarding DV issues as HB1701 provides makes it more likely the courts will recognize true reports of abuse and thus protect the children. Since false reports by mothers are rare, this proceeding will often allow cases that otherwise would take many months or years to be resolved in a few hours. This lets children know much sooner who they will be living with, and their lives are less disrupted.

Economic abuse is an important part of DV, and abusers often use litigation to deliberately bankrupt their victims. The quicker resolution of DV cases will save money on lawyers, evaluators, parent coordinators and investigators. This means the resources are available to families for their children's needs. These good practices also save judicial resources. As part of the research for my Quincy Solution book, I asked doctors who work with the ACE research if children can be saved after exposure to ACEs. Their answer was probably yes, but the safe parent must control medical decisions so the children can get any therapy and medical treatment they need to reduce the stress. It is also important that children are not exposed to further abuse.

Your constituents in Hawaii spend about $4.5 billion every year to tolerate men's abuse of women. Most of this expense comes in health costs, higher insurance premiums, crime and the inability for direct victims and children to reach their economic

potential. Accordingly, Hawaii will enjoy substantial financial savings from the Safe Child Act, but more important, your children can be safe in their homes.

Rather than tell you about the pain inflicted on battered mothers and their children when courts disbelieve true reports of abuse, let me instead convey the incredible excitement and hope, when abused mothers heard that Hawaii became the first state to introduce the Safe Child Act. Children know much more than adults would prefer, but when you pass HB1701 you will shield thousands of Hawaiian children from trauma that none of us want them to suffer. I am sure you entered public office to make a positive difference so let me assure you that passing HB1701 into law will be the best gift you could ever give to the children of Hawaii.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony in support of HB1701.

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 6:36 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: TAMMYSEARLE@AOL.COM
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/28/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Tammy Searle	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

TO: Representative Dee Morikawa, Chair
Representative Bertrand Kobayashi, Vice Chair
House Committee on Human Services

HEARING DATE: February 2, 2016

RE: Testimony in Opposition to HB1701

Good day Representative Morikawa, Representative Kobayashi, and members of the Committee. My name is Jessi Hall. I am an attorney whose practice concentrates in Family Law. I am also a past Chair of the Family Law Section of the Hawaii State Bar Association. I am here today to testify against HB1701.

I understand the purpose of HB1701 as wanting to protect victims of abuse, but the Bill as written is flawed and would be costly upon the residents of the State of Hawaii to implement.

With regards to the new provision "§571-__", it is my understanding that the Family Court judges currently participate in an abundance of trainings, to include some on the issue of domestic violence. To mandate that "all judges and relevant professional personnel of the family courts" to participate in mandatory training will come at great expense. Rarely are trainings or lectures free of charge. Also, the Court calendar is already backlogged, how will the public be accommodated for the time needed to shut down Court operations so that Judges and staff may participate in trainings? Further, who determines what groups are included in "relevant professional personnel of the family courts"?

With regards to §571-46(a)(9), to limit a hearing only to evidence related to family violence would be a waste of judicial time and economy. Most evidence of family violence is directly connected if not identical to the evidence produced in any custody/visitation hearing. By requiring that there be separate hearings to produce essentially the same evidence would take up twice as much of the Court's time and would cost litigants who retain attorneys twice as much.

With regards to §571-46(a)(9)(B)(iv), who is to determine whether an allegation of family violence is made in good faith? What factors do we look at to determine good faith? I have never seen a litigant who makes an allegation of abuse with evidence to support that allegation, although the allegation was found not to rise to the level of abuse, affected negatively. Unfortunately there are those who make false allegations of abuse to either punish the other side or to get a leg up in a custody battle. Those who take such actions are the ones doing a disservice to the truly abused, and they should be held accountable.

With regards to §571-46.4(c), the wording would make it mandatory to have a Custody Evaluator appointed in every case involving family violence. Who is going to pay for that? With the limited list of Custody Evaluators the cost to litigants to

retain one is often in the range of $10,000.00, and sometimes more. Most litigants cannot afford such an expense.

Moving to the subparagraphs, who will be responsible for certifying individuals in the various areas to ensure they have the appropriate credentials? Who is going to pay for such a position? Further, are the Custody Evaluators going to be expected to pay for their own trainings so that they can become certified? If so, I am sure the list of Custody Evaluators will become even shorter than it is now.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to HB1701.

Dara Carlin, M.A.
881 Akiu Place
Kailua, HI 96734
(808) 218-3457

TO: Representative Dee Morikawa, Chair
Representative Kobayashi, Vice Chair
House Human Services Committee Members
DATE: February 2, 2016
RE: **STRONG SUPPORT for HB1701**

Good Morning Chair Morikawa, Vice Chair Kobayashi and HUS Committee Members,

Today I ask for your support for HB1701, *The Safe Child Act*, which is the culmination of decades of research put into usable best practices that will save not only time and money, but lives.

Since the 1980s, the rate of divorce in the United States has hovered around the 50% mark, a statistic recently reaffirmed by the *National Center for Health Statistics*. While I don't know the exact statistics for Hawaii, I'm sure our Judiciary would confirm that the majority of divorces occur silently, privately and without incident - an uncontested parting of ways between two people who perhaps can only agree on one last thing: that it is best for all parties involved, children included, to part ways. By contrast, the minority of divorces are what take up the majority of the Judiciary's time, effort and resources and the majority of these cases involve a history of domestic violence which is validated *by the statistic for domestic violence of one in four women.*

The biggest misconception about domestic violence is "It's over once she leaves him" which makes logical sense: separate the abuser from the victim and it's over; he'll "cool off", she'll get the support she needs to recover from the abuse, and once the couple divorces, they'll each be "adult enough" to refocus their attention on the best interests of their children. **The reality of domestic violence is "It's not over until *he says* it's over".**

Think of a dog with its favorite chew toy - the one he just can't live without. The favorite chew toy is usually one so "loved on" that its original form is barely recognizable, right? What happens if you try to take that chew toy away? What does the dog do if the chew toy goes missing or you try to hide it? What if you distract the dog with new chew toys? It may "forget" about its favorite for awhile but if you try to take it, what does the dog do? THAT'S the carnal level domestic violence cases operate on, yet they're currently treated with a "time out", perhaps a scolding for bad behavior, but ultimately admonished to "play nice" for the sake of the children. (While I realize a dog's chew toy is a poor image to convey of DV survivors, the point is she's just as helpless to stop the dog from *his behaviors* - *she* cannot stop him no matter what she does/tries because she broke the cardinal rule of DV: "*You will not leave me*".)

Rather than get into all the complex details about domestic violence, post-separation violence, DV by proxy, child abuse, etc. let me please explain **how HB1701 will help:**

The "*Mandatory ongoing training in domestic violence advocacy*" provision will help to assure that our judges receive ongoing training on the most current and valid scientific research, which in turn will make them experts in domestic violence themselves. As someone who spent most of my career in Child Protective Services work, I thought I was merely switching one victim for another (child for woman) when I began working in the DV movement. I was humbled by how much I *didn't know*, which is part of the problem for so many professionals: they *think* they know what DV is, but they don't, YET they treat DV cases anyway = malpractice and that's why we see so many poor outcomes, hear so many complaints and have to bear witness to so many homicides as we do. I cannot stress this enough: **I was a social services professional for almost 20 years who *thought* she knew what she was doing until I was schooled otherwise.**

The "*if the case involves allegations or a history of family violence, the court shall first hold an evidentiary hearing that shall be limited to evidence related to the issue of family violence*" provision will put the cases in their proper context; basically lower the chance and instances of "misdiagnoses" so that DV cases are not handled as "high conflict" and "high conflict" are not mislabeled as DV.

Re: the provision for "*A parent's allegation of family violence, if made in good faith, shall not be a factor that weighs against the parent in determining custody or visitation*": As strange as this sounds, many survivors don't realize they were victims until long after they left and only recognize their abuse when the abuser continues his pattern of coercive control, mistreatment and abuse with the children. When survivors report these incidents - as many of them have been directed/instructed to do - they become the subject of scrutiny for alleging such abuse and are often accused of the junk science premise of "parental alienation" - raising abuse allegations to sway or "to get a leg up" in custody decisions.

The "*appointment of a child custody evaluator*" provisions will alleviate lengthy waiting periods for Custody Evaluator (CE) assignment by widening the pool of available CEs. Underutilized resources could be included in this pool under (1) as well as Kapiolani Sex Abuse Treatment Center professionals under (2). According to *the National Alliance on Mental Illness*:

Approximately 1 in 5 adults in the U.S. experiences mental illness in a given year.
Approximately 1 in 25 adults in the U.S. experiences a serious mental illness in a given year that substantially interferes with or limits one or more major life activities.

In consideration of low mental health statistics, it's clear that mental health professionals need not exclusively be assigned in all CE cases. Again, this is a matter of expertise: knowing what kind of professional to assign to each case. Abusers standardly use "the nut or slut" excuse to explain why their wives have "inexplicably taken off" with the children: she's either mentally ill or promiscuous and cheating - which is one of the many red flags that you're looking at a DV case. A doctor once told me "If you seek out a surgeon's opinion, don't be surprised if the recommendation is to cut" while a DV mentor said "**It's NOT 'paranoia' when there really is someone out to get you**". Context is everything and again: as a Masters level Marriage & Family

Therapist who specialized in child abuse cases, I thought I knew what DV was all about when I was actually devoid of all wisdom and knowledge on the issue.

Requested language changes to HB1701:

While the LRB surmounted an incredible task by inserting the Safe Child Act into HRS format and did a phenomenal job of doing so, a few items were overlooked, the most important of which would be on **Page 3 at the end of line 9**. Can we please ADD "in consultation with a domestic violence expert or advocate" so it reads: "...shall make investigations and reports in consultation with a domestic violence expert or advocate that shall be made available to all interested parties..."? Can we also add/follow that up with: "As part of the investigation, the professional assigned shall consult with a domestic violence advocate or other expert who spends a majority of their working hours seeking to prevent domestic violence"?

Adding this language is helpful because DV expertise is already immediately present and available (*DVAC on Oahu, Women Helping Women on Maui, Turning Point on the Big Island, etc.*) to family court professionals who may not yet be "up to speed" in DV best practices AND such inclusion affords a multi-disciplinary approach that better safeguards children. Again, the purpose of adding such language is to reduce/eliminate the possibility of children being exposed to traumatic events known to be caused by exposure to an abuser.

On **Page 2 line 11** could we please ADD the words "or unwilling" so it would read: ..."unless the court finds that a parent is unable or unwilling to act..."? The reason being that "unable" by itself would suggest a mental health reason and typically abusers *could* act appropriately but don't because they want to harm their victim/the survivor.

On **Page 8 in line 6** Can we REMOVE "or other designated counseling?" DV is not caused by mental illness and abusers need *an accountability program* rather than mental health treatment which is not helpful regarding abuse even if it may help with other problems.

On **Page 9 in line 9** Can we REMOVE "or with the perpetrator of the family violence"? It is not safe or ethical to allow a victim-survivor to engage in any counseling with the abuser. Ordering this only "rewards" the abuser.

On **Page 12 in line 1** Can we ADD the word "voluntarily" before cohabit? We don't want exceptions if the victim was forced or pressured to cohabit with her abuser or rapist.

Mahalo for this opportunity to provide testimony in strong support for HB1701.

Respectfully,

Dara Carlin, M.A.

Dara Carlin, M.A.
Domestic Violence Survivor Advocate

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2016 9:49 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: thepoags@usa.net
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/31/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Derek Poag	Individual	Support	No

Comments: Very important Bill

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2016 5:03 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: kalen.holbrook@gmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/31/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Kalen Holbrook	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2016 12:48 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: KimMyers4158@hotmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/31/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Kimberly Myers	Individual	Support	No

Comments: Hawaii State Legislature I am offering testimony which will hopefully show the need for the enactment of HB1701 (Safe Child Act) in Hawaii, and hopefully will convince other States to follow the lead of legislators in Hawaii. The Safe Child Act will offer protection to children from court- ordered abuse and the harmful outcomes which have been researched and provided in the ACE (Adverse Childhood Experiences) Studies. Our case began in March of 2008 when my five year old grandchild revealed sexual abuse by a relative outside our immediate family. My daughter and her child resided with my husband and me since her child was born. We contacted the police, who sent us to CYS (Children and Youth Services). The first investigation was unfounded, even with testimony from the child's therapist. CYS then came to our home, and demanded they search the premises and insisted we sign a Family Service Plan. I first refused to sign anything but the caseworker stated they were going to the school to pick up my grandchild, so I signed and allowed the search of our home. The child was sent to Victim Services for eight months and continued to reveal that she had been sexually abused. There were three more investigations, two physical examinations of the child which proved she had been (repeatedly) sexually abused, but those reports also came back as “unfounded”. There was testimony from two therapists, two physicians, and numerous school personnel who testified that the child revealed sexual abuse. My daughter and I were sent to a custody evaluator who wa s paid by the perpetrator (a sum of 5,000 dollars) and produced a fifteen page report that stated we were purposely trying to destroy the child's relationship with the alleged offender, with reference to Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS). The report stated that we had made repeated false allegations against the alleged perpetrator. The evaluator's report was the only evidence used to make a determination to remove my grandchild from her home and family and put her in foster care for seven months. After spending close to $100,000 to protect our child, she was finally returned to her Mother (my daughter) but a stipulation was added that forced my daughter to move from our home with her child. The perpetrator was awarded custody of the child every other weekend, but excluded overnight visits. My husband and I are permitted to see our grandchild anytime, but we are not permitted to have her for overnight visits. (with no negative evidence against us) These court cases involving either Domestic Violence or Child Abuse produce the same outcome for thousands of children each year. Even with evidence of abuse, the courts ignore valid evidence and return the child to harmful and traumatizing abuse. The families desperately try to save the child and eventually lose their life savings and even their homes in an effort to stop the abuse. These types of cases are referred to as “high conflict custody disputes.” Perpetrators are seldom prosecuted because they never see a criminal courtroom, and horrible outcomes are routine in the family court system. I am asking for the State of Hawaii to take the lead in the protection of children. Enact the Safe Child Act to produce effective protection for children, to save children from the effects of trauma, to force the courts to weig h first and foremost the

safety of children, and to save billions of dollars for taxpayers by reforming this broken system. Sincerely, Kimberly R. Myers Chapter Leader Stop Abuse Campaign 814-525-6333

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Good Morning Representatives,

I hold a degree in Psychology, and with a few credits shy of a Doctorate in Clinical Psychology, I would like to strongly urge you to pass HB1701 for the children of Hawaii.

As a doctoral student, I would like to share a disturbing account about a case in the Family Court of Oahu where three small children were placed in unsupervised custody with the father who was known to the court for perpetrating domestic violence against the mother as acknowledged by a 5 year protective order. Despite the father's abusiveness, the children were not allowed to be on this protective order.

The father was court ordered by DHS to attend Parenting Classes, Domestic Violence Classes and Psychological services but the father did not attend the Domestic Violence program as ordered. Even though the children would later disclose to police at the Children's Justice Center that their father had physically and sexually abused them during their visitations with him, the abuse of the children continued and escalated even while under DHS "Family Supervision". Even with ongoing disclosures of abuse by the children, the court and DHS allowed the case to close with the court inexplicably ordering joint unsupervised visitation.

The children continued to report sexual abuse to their mother, doctors, therapists and police. One of the youngest of these children suffered two broken arms within a 6 month timeframe while on visitation with her father, the first occurring the very first day the father's unsupervised visitation. Even though he did not seek or get medical attention for the child's broken arm, he still was granted continued unsupervised visitation and joint custody. DHS refused to investigate the second broken arm which also happened during the father's unsupervised visitation.

One of the children who disclosed sexual abuse was confirmed to have Bacterial Vaginosis, a vaginal infection due to foreign bacteria being introduced into the vagina, extremely rare in a young child. According to the Centers for Disease Control (2015) Bacterial Vaginosis is considered one of the most common sexually transmitted infections in sexually assaulted women. Even in light of this information both Family Court and DHS continued to allow the father to have unsupervised visitations and joint custody of the children.

Currently, these children are living in the same home, unsupervised, with the man whose both physically and sexually abused them while their mother has now been prohibited from contacting or seeing them in any way. Because she sought medical treatment, psychological care and legal protection for her children in response to their abuse, the court and DHS now see her as the problem for not effectively co-parenting and allege that the mother coached the children to disclose abuse.

We need the Safe Child Act in place to help situations like this from occurring. Children's health and safety should be the priority when custody determinations are made about their lives, especially when there has been Domestic Violence, sexual abuse, physical abuse or psychological abuse in the family or parental relationship.

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 10:13 AM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: mjshumate@comcast.net
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/30/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
mark Shumate	Individual	Comments Only	No

Comments: please note that female perpetrated violence is common. In Georgia in 2014, roughly 25 % of domestic violence temporary protective orders were issued against a female perpetrator. Further female perpetrators commonly use false accusations and threats of loss of child custody as mechanisms to control the male victim. A documented example of this and more information is available at www.gnvpc.org

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 4:16 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: mjshumate@comcast.net
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM

HB1701
Submitted on: 1/30/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
mark Shumate	Individual	Comments Only	No

Comments: By providing no "penalty" for false allegations of domestic violence you encourage divorce by allegation. In my research I can find no case for perjured testimony about domestic violence. Stating that there is no penalty further encourages it. Further the bill is written in a way that encourages trained and biased people to make major family decisions with limited information. Just like they used to say that "no one was ever fired for recommending IBM ", no one ever was held open to much scrutiny for siding with the mother. Easy and quick assessments based on the outdated notion that women are passive victims only are dangerous. More information about female perpetrated abuse at https://www.yahoo.com/health/the-number-of-male-domestic-1284479771263030.html

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

This is how the Safe Child Act could have helped me and my children stay safe from abuse:

1) Protective Orders in my case were not awarded because police were not properly trained and did not arrest our abuser.

2) The custody arrangement prior to my harmful order left children unsupervised with an abuser, who encouraged one child to beat and choke the other child, nearly killing him.

3) Court personal that were involved in my case included several judges, 4 different court appointed family evaluators and therapists, and one mediator (none of which were adequately trained in abuse or domestic violence).

4) Time and $ that could have been saved by the safe child act:
10 years of my and my children's lives, being able to get free sooner and have the resources to do so. $100K in debt from fighting a 5 year court battle, having to relive and prove the abuse happened over and over again. Over $600 a month for therapy (going on 5 years now) for my and my son's PTSD from the abuse. Nearing $50k in medical expenses over the past 10 years for physical symptoms caused from the abuse. Over $500K in lost wages from the financial abuse and not being allowed to work while with the abuser.

5) Please pass the Safe Child Act into law. No act can do more for our children and families, preventing illness, saving money, and preventing future abuse from happening.

Darby Munroe, M. Ed.

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 8:48 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: circeyee@yahoo.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

LATE

HB1701
Submitted on: 2/1/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Circe Carr	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 8:51 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: daldoscarr@gmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

LATE

HB1701
Submitted on: 2/1/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Daldos Carr	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

kobayashi2-Jessi

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 9:04 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: pyatsushiro@yahoo.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

LATE

HB1701
Submitted on: 2/1/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
pat yatsushiro	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Edward Thompson, III

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 11:33 PM
To: HUStestimony
Cc: chaymer83@gmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB1701 on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM*

LATE

HB1701
Submitted on: 2/1/2016
Testimony for HUS on Feb 2, 2016 09:00AM in Conference Room 329

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Christine	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov