

**Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force
Hawai'i State Capitol, Room 414
August 16, 2007
Minutes**

Members Present: Senator Russell Kokubun, Representative Pono Chong, Ian Costa, Senator Mike Gabbard, Marion Higa, Jeffrey Hunt, Karl Kim, Millie Kim, Keith Kurahashi, Brad Kurokawa, Senator Ron Menor, Keith Rollman, Jane Testa, Stacie Thorlakson, Beth Tokioka, Senator Jill Tokuda, Pamela Tumpap

Members Not Present: Representative Lyla Berg, Henry Eng, David Goode, Representative Colleen Meyer, James Spencer, Michael Tresler, Representative Ryan Yamane

- I. Call to Order.** A quorum was established and Chair Russell Kokubun called the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, August 16, 2007, at the Hawai'i State Capitol in Room 414. Introduction of task force members.
- II. Review and Approve of Minutes.** The minutes from the July 6, 2007 task force meeting was distributed to members. Chair Russell Kokubun entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Beth Tokioka moved to approve the minutes; Ian Costa seconded the motion. Chair Kokubun opened discussion on the minutes. The task force unanimously approved the July 6, 2007 minutes.
- III. Discussion and Approval of Goals, Strategies and Measures.** Chair Russell Kokubun informed task force members that a decision on the plan's goals, strategies and measures will need to be made at today's meeting.

Before opening discussion on the goals, strategies and measures, Chair Kokubun asked Jim Dannemiller of SMS Research to report on the recently completed statewide telephone survey. Jim stated that the intent of the survey was to measure resident's reaction to propositions of Hawai'i's long-range future. The sample was 2,000 respondents, 500 from each county. The content of the survey was taken largely from the community engagement meetings. To some extent, the survey was also looking to see if the concerns raised at the community engagement meetings were the same as those who were surveyed or vice-versa. Results showed that respondents to the survey had much of the same concerns as those who attended the community meetings. The results also showed that respondents wanted balance, for example, they were not interested in having a booming economy at the expense of the environment or interested in having an extremely clean environment at the expense of the economy. They also were not interested in having a clean environment, booming economy at the expense of social and cultural elements in the society. The survey asked tough questions, for example, "Would

you like this even if it costs more?” or “If we raised your taxes to pay for it, would you like it?” or “Would you trade this for that?” Jim noted that the results also showed that some scores for the environment-related questions were slightly higher than the economy-related questions so some residents felt that there should be more focus on the environment rather than the economy. He added that the time the survey was taken has an effect on the responses—if the survey was taken in 1992 or 1993, the results would probably be different.

Chair Kokubun commented results from the telephone survey seem to confirm that the community is interested in this approach regarding the triple-bottom line as a definition of sustainability and the need for balance between the economy, environment, and social well-being. Jim also noted that responses from the neighbor islands were no different from O‘ahu—responses were similar from county to county. Jeffrey Hunt asked if the segregation by county or actual island. Jim responded by county but noted that data by island could be provided. Chair Kokubun requested that Jim provide the data by island to all members.

Beth Tokioka inquired about the difference between “percent” and “valid percent.” Jim responded that “valid percent” is used when a “don’t know” category shows up—total percent would include “don’t knows” and a valid percent would not include “don’t knows.”

Representative Pono Chong inquired that when respondents were asked “In the future, do you think ...” questions, did they interpret the question to ask what they wanted in the future or could they have misinterpreted it to ask how they would predict the future. Jim could not say exactly how respondents interpreted the questions, but noted that the questions were phrased using “it *should* grow” instead of “it *will* grow.”

Karl Kim commented that the report provided useful analysis and asked if Jim could share a little more on how the six groups were determined. Jim responded that a class segmentation method was used. This method looks at people’s attitude and creates the segmentations based on the factor analysis.

Senator Mike Gabbard inquired if the overall results were broken down by ethnic group as well as the group profiles—the group profiles indicated percentages of Caucasian, Japanese, and Hawaiian. Jim responded that the overall results were probably broken down by ethnic groups and mistakenly excluded from the report but no break down for the group profiles.

Representative Chong asked when and at what time was the survey conducted. Jim responded that the survey was conducted over a period of about three weeks, every day except holidays (which he believes no holidays occurred during the survey period), from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on weekdays (until 8:00 p.m. on the neighbor islands), and from 10:00 a.m. to 7:00/8:00 p.m. on weekends. Representative Chong also asked if the statistics, especially regarding income, are similar to other studies conducted—most of the respondents seemed to be in the higher income brackets. Jim responded that the

statistics are comparable to other studies conducted but added that income is a difficult statistic to analyze because most respondents will probably indicate a lower income bracket than the actual.

Senator Jill Tokuda commented on the length of the survey. Jim responded that the survey was relatively short and took about ten minutes. Pamela Tumpap commented on the total number of individuals phoned to reach the sample amount, including those who chose not to respond to the survey. Jim noted that the average is about 40-48 percent.

Chair Kokubun thanked Jim for sharing the results and that he provide the additional information requested by task force members. Chair Kokubun also informed members that if funds are available, another telephone survey may be conducted after the draft plan is completed.

Chair Kokubun moved discussion to the draft plan's goals, strategies and measures. The draft plan (version 6.0) presented to the task force incorporates input received from the Hawai'i 2050 Business Leadership Council (BLC), environmental groups (ENV), Kanaka Maoli groups (KM), and the Economic Development Alliance of Hawai'i (EDAH). Bill Kaneko commented on material provided in the member's distribution packets. The handout on *Characteristics of Effective Indicators* provides some background information and may be useful in the upcoming discussion on the goals, strategies and measures.

Pamela asked Bill if he would be making recommendations on whether the indicators presented in version 6.0 are relevant, reliable, etc. Bill responded he felt the indicators presented in the previous version, 5.1.1, were relevant. Pamela clarified that the indicators Bill was referring to are those not highlighted in version 6.0 and those indicators are doable and the others are up for discussion.

Chair Kokubun commented on another handout provided in the member's packets—Goals, Strategies and Measurements Decision Tree. This handout indicates suggested revisions and who provided those revisions.

Chair Kokubun reminded task force members that decisions made today will be incorporated into the draft plan, which will be presented to the public at the Sustainability Summit. The public will have another opportunity to provide input and comment on the draft plan before the plan is finalized and presented to the Legislature.

Chair Kokubun began discussion on the suggested revisions to the vision statement by commenting that the KM requested that the term "Kanaka Maoli" be used in place of "Native Hawaiian" throughout the plan. Pamela suggested including a definition for Kanaka Maoli if used to replace Native Hawaiian. Since no member voiced concerns or objections to the change, Chair Kokubun assumed members agreed with the change and proceeded to the next revision. Representative Chong suggested that "diverse" be included before "island values and culture" to be inclusive of all cultures in the State. Members agreed.

Members had the following concerns with the suggested revisions in the vision statement.

¹BLC:

In 2050, Hawai'i is a sustainable community. Living responsibly and within our own means is top-of-mind for all individuals and organizations. We learn about the virtues and values of a sustainable Hawai'i. As a result, our goals of economic prosperity, social and community well-being, and environmental stewardship are **in balance**¹.

Beth had concerns that if “in balance” replaces “are met,” the vision of meeting our goals are lost and believes it is important to achieve our goals. Pamela suggested adding “balanced” before “goals” and keeping “are met” at the end. Senator Tokuda commented that if “balanced” is added, the idea of the triple-bottom line being in balance with each other may be lost. Keith Kurahashi suggested adding “and are met” to read “in balance and are met.” To avoid wordsmithing, Chair Kokubun suggested having staff make the necessary revisions, keeping the ideas that the goals are in balance with each other and are met.

²EDAH and ³ENV:

Our Native Hawaiian and island values and culture are perpetuated. **Our vibrant, clean and diversified economy and skilled workforce provide employment opportunities**² for our children. Our land, water and natural resources are used responsibly, and are replenished and preserved for future generations. We respect and live within the natural resources and limits of our islands **while protecting native habitats**³.

Stacie suggested using “environment” instead of “economy” since economy and skilled workforce can be an environment. Members felt that “economy” and “environment” were different and should not be changed. The environment is also addressed in the next two sentences.

Representative Chong shared concerns with the use of “clean” in reference to the economy and energy in paragraphs 2 and 3, respectively. A “clean” economy would take out a lot of what we have now and would promote only certain types of industries. Military, tourism, and construction are not considered “clean” industries. The vision of using “clean” energy may be difficult to achieve; as an island state, we rely on air travel and in the future air travel will probably still require jet fuel. Members agreed. In response to Representative Chong’s concerns, Brad Kurokawa questioned if the vision should aim high or strive for goals that are more realistic. Keith Kurahashi commented that the vision should be to get to a cleaner economy, cleaner environment, etc. and industries like the military are making strides to become more “green.” We probably will never become entirely “clean” but could strive to become “cleaner.” This is our vision, and we should be moving towards achieving a “cleaner” state. Keith Rollman commented that the word “clean” doesn’t have a hard definition. Representative Chong further commented that his belief is that the vision should be connected tightly to the

goals and indicators and cannot be separate. Chair Kokubun commented that we are projecting to the year 2050 and technology will change and this is sort of our ideal goal that we are striving for. With respects to aiming high, Karl suggested adding “desirable” before “employment opportunities.” Chair Kokubun asked members if there was still concern about “clean” or should it be left in. Task force members agreed to keep “clean” in. Chair Kokubun felt that “desirable” was not necessary because it would be subjective—desirable to whom? Members agreed.

Jeffrey and Pam inquired on the meaning of native habitat. Chair Kokubun responded that he believes it meant endangered species habitat but will clarify with the environmental group.

Senator Tokuda acknowledged that the last sentence of the second paragraph was discussed at previous meetings, but expressed concerns that it could be interpreted as “no-growth.” Pamela shared the same concerns. Beth commented that protection of our native habitats can be assumed if we respect our natural resources. Jeffrey agreed. Chair Kokubun clarified if the preference would be to remove revision 3 and address it in the goals and indicators. Members concurred.

⁴ENV:

In 2050, the energy we use is clean, renewable and produced mostly in Hawai‘i. Much of the food we consume is produced locally. **We minimize waste by recycling⁴.** We are a strong and healthy community with access to affordable housing, transportation and healthcare. Our public education system prepares our people for productive, meaningful and fulfilled lives.

Senator Ron Menor commented whether the task force would consider broadening the revision. When you speak of promoting a better energy future for Hawai‘i, it’s not only in terms of developing more energy sources but entails energy conservation and energy efficiency. Keith Rollman added that the more precise the vision statement is made, the more inclusive it needs to become. He is willing to live with the concept that waste to energy is a recycling process. Keith Rollman suggested using the following language, “We minimize waste by encouraging conservation.” Task force members agreed.

Chair Kokubun moved forward to the suggested revision in the guiding principles.

⁵ENV:

- We respect and live within the natural resources and limits of our islands **while protecting native habitats⁵.**

Chair Kokubun suggested that since the revision 3 was removed from the vision statement and would be addressed in one of the goals, revision 5 should also be removed. Members agreed.

Senator Menor commented that energy self-sufficiency is not mentioned in the guiding principles and it is part of the mission statement. The guiding principles provide the framework of the implementing actions. Task force members responded that energy self-sufficiency is addressed in Goal 3.

Chair Kokubun opened discussion on the suggested revisions to Goal 1.

Strategic Actions:

⁶KM; ⁷BLC, EDAH; ⁸ENV:

1. Develop a sustainability ethic.

➤ Integrate Kanaka Maoli and other sustainability practices into government agency and community organization policies⁶.

2. Conduct on-going forums and dialogue amongst government, environmental, business, labor, and community groups to promote collaboration and progress on achieving Hawaii's sustainability goals.^{7, 8}

Senator Tokuda requested examples of Kanaka Maoli or other sustainable practices that would be integrated into government agency or community organization policies. Chair Kokubun cross-referenced another handout provided by KM and responded that the group was seeking “buy-in” by government with respect to sustainability practices, such as water and the in-stream flow standards or kapu system on fishing. Representative Chong commented that those were big issues addressed during the past legislative session and if made part of the plan; could either complement or contradict the rest of the plan without knowing the impact. Keith Rollman commented that using “Integrate” sounds like a mandate and that you don’t have a choice. Pamela commented that integration may be possible in government but how would you do it with community organizations. Representative Chong shared those same concerns.

Bill commented that in terms of process, the recommendations were taken from each of these groups and put them in verbatim. The process was very transparent and open. The recommendations of the various groups were placed into the document where appropriate. The drafting team did not wordsmith the sentiments of the groups other than where noted.

Beth commented that Goal 5 specifically addresses Kanaka Maoli culture and island values and may be duplicative in Goal 1. Goal 5 could be made clearer to address these issues. Millie Kim had concerns with the grammar of the revision—Kanaka Maoli are people but are we referring to KM practices and other sustainability practices and not integrating Kanaka Maoli (people) into government. Chair Kokubun confirmed that the statement refers to KM practices and other sustainability practices. Chair Kokubun requested that Bill and his team model the strategic action after education of the general community and government agencies. Pamela suggested combining the previous strategic action and the KM recommendation. Representative Chong expressed concerns

with having two separate sets of practices. The plan should be comprehensive and inclusive—listing Kanaka Maoli in the vision may be adequate instead of mentioning it throughout the plan. Individuals may feel that the plan is creating two sets of practices—Hawaiian practices and non-Hawaiian practices. Some members agreed that Kanaka Maoli may be too repetitive throughout the plan.

Bill clarified that revision 6 would be removed and “principles and practices” would be added to the end of the previous bullet of the first strategic action. Chair Kokubun agreed.

Task force members did not object to the revision in the second strategic action recommended by the BLC and EDAH.

Indicators:

⁹ENV; ¹⁰KM:

- Per capita energy consumption⁹.
- Number of governmental agencies and community organizations integrating Kanaka Maoli and other sustainability practices and policies¹⁰.

Representative Chong inquired if revision 9 is presently being measured and if it includes tourists. He also made a request at a previous meeting for a list of existing indicators, what are being used, and what needs to be created. Bill responded that the list was provided to task force members and offered to forward the information to him again. Pamela inquired if energy consumption refers to electricity. Representative Chong stated that the federal government measures energy consumption overall—energy, electricity, solar, etc. and where it comes from. He also added if, prior to the adoption of the final draft, information on what the indicators are, who measures it, what formula is used, and who is the source could be provided to the task force. Chair Kokubun clarified with Representative Chong that energy should be qualified. Pamela added that it would depend on who the source is—if the federal government is the source, you may want to leave it as energy; if the local electric company, then you may want to change to electricity.

Senator Menor commented that some things are measurable and some are not. You would want to have data on those that are measurable. For example, amount of fossil fuels used by the utility companies or amount of gasoline sold. This data could determine whether we are moving towards greater energy self-sufficiency and independence.

Representative Chong also commented that the strategic actions and indicators don't seem to match with each other or seem to be in the wrong place. Bill responded that Goal 1 focused on consumer behavior. The consumer would determine whether living sustainability is part of their daily practice. The indicators like energy and water consumption or the types of cars we purchase would determine whether our society lives by a sustainable ethic. In terms of what is being produced or supplied is addressed in Goal 3. Pamela suggested if narratives were provided with the strategic actions and

indicators, the goals may be clearer to understand. Keith Kurahashi commented that energy consumption is broad enough to cover data that is easily measurable and available. Marion Higa commented that as a group, these indicators belong here because they are outcomes—the outcome of the activities of the strategic action would be reflected in “people behavior” that is being measured. Representative Chong further commented that if the Goal 1 indicators will provide data that consumers are moving towards sustainability, then the bulk of indicators should be listed in Goal 1—everything from fuel to food. The indicators seem to be all over the place. The draft should be clearly presented so that individuals reading the plan are able to understand it. Keith Rollman commented that he believes the indicators are comprehensive and correct and if the data generated from the indicators fall under another goal, it could be determined later. Jeffrey agreed. Representative Chong disagreed saying that a strategic plan should be clear and the indicators in the right place and communicate the right vision, otherwise all readers will have a different understanding of it. Jeffrey added that he agrees with the need for clarity and understanding of the breakdown but the breakdown does not have to be absolute and can fit in other goals.

Chair Kokubun acknowledged Representative Chong’s concerns that the plan be cohesive and focused but expressed the need to get through the remaining suggested revisions; then determine if they are in the right place. Task force members agreed.

Chair Kokubun clarified keeping revision 9. Members agreed. With regards to revision 10, Pamela suggested using the same language as the strategic action—“sustainability principles and practices.” Keith Kurahashi suggested the following language: “Number of governmental agencies and community organizations that establish sustainability practices and policies. Members agreed.

Chair Kokubun continued by opening discussion on the suggested revisions to Goal 2.

Strategic Actions:

¹¹Those industries include, but are not limited to, renewable energy, innovation and science-based industries, and environmental technologies.

¹²KM; ¹³ and ¹⁴BLC and EDAH; ¹⁵BLC, EDAH, and ENV; ¹⁶ and ¹⁷BLC:

1. Develop a more diverse and resilient economy.

- Increase incentives that foster sustainability-related industries.¹¹
- Provide support for subsistence-based businesses and economies.¹²

2. Support the building blocks for economic stability and sustainability.¹³

- Recognize and support the visitor industry, military and construction as strong components of the Hawaii economy.¹⁴
- Provide incentives for existing industries to operate in more sustainable ways.
- Ensure adequate funding available for infrastructure improvements.¹⁵
- Attract local and outside capital and investments in Hawaii’s economic activities¹⁶.

3. Increase the competitiveness of Hawai'i's workforce.

- Invest and improve our public education system to provide for a skilled workforce.¹⁷

Beth inquired if there was a generally accepted definition for “subsistence-based business and economies. Chair Kokubun responded that he believes there is. Bill commented that the strategic action was placed in goal 2 because it dealt with economic development but also noted that an entire new subset was also created in Goal 5 addressing pursuit of Kanaka Maoli lifestyles and practices. Task force members agreed to move revision 12 to Goal 5.

Jane Testa clarified that revision 12 would be removed from Goal 2 and placed in Goal 5 and commented that the definition of subsistence-based business includes the whole realm of community-based economic development which may or may not have any relation to culture specific subsistence practices, but is a recognized community-based economic development model. Karl also sees this in terms of barter, trade, or other economic implications. Brad also added that diversified economy which is similar to barter as mentioned by Karl and is not based only on Kanaka Maoli. For example, farmers grow papayas and there might be a value system in that. It may be on the fringe but its becoming a more viable source in terms of food security. He would like to keep subsistence-based in Goal 2 because it encompasses another paradigm that is being encouraged beyond the typical economy. Beth referred to the decision tree handout commenting that it seems that the KM group was looking beyond themselves—“KM wants opportunities for KM and others for subsistence-based practices.” Marion questioned if the concern is with the word “subsistence” and would it be better if the term “community-based” was used. Jane responded that it would be broader but would not address the issue. Chair Kokubun commented that the intent was that KM wanted to focus on this concept of “subsistence” as part of their lifestyle.

Senator Tokuda believes that community-based economic development and subsistence-based living or businesses are two different things to many people. It would be appropriate to move revision 12 to Goal 5 because Goal 5 was expanded to include island values.

Chair Kokubun noted that revision 12 will be moved to Goal 5 as a new strategic action with further discussion to follow.

Representative Chong commented on the use of the word “play” in the goal statement. Keith Kurahashi responded that he believes it has a proper place in the statement because a better economy, better wages, allows more free time for leisure. Many residents today have two or more jobs and have little or not time for leisure.

Representative Chong had concerns with the use of “Increase incentives” in the first bullet point of the first strategic action—it could be perceived as incentives already provided are not enough and the need to provide more. He also had concerns with

choosing the next industry, the second bullet point—why technology-based industries and not something else. Keith Rollman commented that he believes that in the future there will be some kind of knowledge industry and this function of technology transfer will be present. It is an important facet of every community that has been successful in establishing a knowledge industry. The industry is not defined—it could be engineering or some kind of science. Pamela commented on Representative Chong’s concerns with the first bullet point saying that on Maui several recycling companies have closed even though there were state incentives, it still wasn’t profitable. For example, they were not able to get enough plastics—they would still be in business if there were other kinds of incentives. Representative Chong commented that government should promote certain industries but let the market place and investors choose what the future industry will be and partner. We should not be the ones choosing technology because that’s the “buzz” word for the day.

Karl responded why it was okay to choose visitor, military, and construction industries in the first bullet point of the second strategic action—why not agriculture or health care. Representative Chong responded that it was the recommendation of the business council but assumes they are the three largest sectors. Keith Rollman added that all those industries could fall under technology. Beth commented that to get the private sector to move in the direction of sustainability, you need to provide incentives or mandate policies. They will not proceed on their own unless there is a financial advantage. She believes that just fostering sustainability-related industries is too vague. Representative Chong commented that if the task force strongly supports the first bullet point, he suggests using “Provide” instead of “Increase.” Task force members agreed.

Chair Kokubun, acknowledging Representative Chong’s concerns and objection, asked if members had any objections to the second bullet point of the first strategic action. Representative Chong noted that if members had no objections, he was okay with leaving it in. Chair Kokubun confirmed that the second bullet will remain intact and opened discussion on the second strategic action (revisions 13-16).

Pamela made the following suggestions to the second strategic action: remove “existing from second bullet point and add, from the SMS survey, another bullet to reduce regulation and lower the cost of running a business.

Senator Menor commented that revision 14 should use more general language to include other industries such as agriculture, finance, retail, etc. Karl agreed. Senator Tokuda suggested using the following language: “Recognize and support established industries such as the visitor industry, military, construction, and agriculture as strong components of the Hawai‘i economy.” Task force members concurred.

Beth had concerns with revision 15. Many times when a company comes in, they need to put in the improvements themselves and if the strategic action is to “ensure adequate funding,” the assumption is that government will provide all of the infrastructure. Keith Rollman commented that the funding source is not identified. Senator Menor understands Beth’s concerns that “adequate funding” could be perceived as “government

funding” when it should be both public and private funding. Senator Menor suggested the following language: “Ensure adequate infrastructure improvements.” No objections from the task force.

Members had no objections to revisions 16 and 17.

Representative Chong requested clarification on “‘centers of excellence’ in innovation- and technology-based educational programs.” Task force members responded that it refers to programs such as the STEM program. Representative Chong had concerns that it should not be industry-specific but promotes any type of post-secondary education program. Senator Tokuda commented that this is referring to high school students and not post-secondary students. Pamela agreed. Representative Chong commented that if it refers to secondary students, it could be covered under the first bullet. Pamela responded that she sees this as an “opt-in” program—measuring students who opted-into these training programs as opposed to general improvement of the whole educational system as she sees the first bullet refers to. Representative Chong had concerns with the perception of the plan endorsing a specific program. Beth agrees with Representative Chong that there is a need to address students continuing in post-secondary education. Chair Kokubun suggested reworking on the third bullet to address post-secondary education.

Indicators:

¹⁸BLC; ¹⁹EDAH; ²⁰BLC; ²¹BLC and EDAH; ²²KM

- Percentage of local economy composed of visitor, military and construction¹⁸ expenditures.
- Living wage jobs as a percentage of total jobs Hawai'i and compared to national average.¹⁹
- Number of science and engineering endowed chairs at the state's universities.²⁰
- Cost of state government as a percentage of the state economy.²¹
- Proportion of capital provided to sustain subsistence based business and economies.²²

Chair Kokubun suggested the following for revision 18: “Percentage of local economy by industries and sectors.” No objections by members.

Task force members also had no objections to revision 19. Chair Kokubun commented if revision 20 is an indicator that needs to be measured. Senator Tokuda commented that it could be covered in one of the other indicators above. Keith Kurahashi suggested adding an indicator that measured the number of college graduates. Task force members agreed to delete revisions 20 and 21 and address revision 22 in Goal 5. Pamela suggested that since a new strategic action was added, a measurement of reduced business regulation should also be added. Task force members asked how it would be measured. Chair Kokubun suggested that Bill work on developing a measurement for that. Karl suggested adding another indicator to measure the acreage of land in agricultural production. Representative Chong suggested measuring the sales of agricultural products versus the

acreage of land. Chair Kokubun suggested measuring both the acreage of land in agricultural production and sales of agricultural products. Task force members agreed.

Representative Chong apologized for not attending the previous meeting and clarified that since the Sustainability Council has been approved by the task force, these measurements put forth in the plan will be used to grade the state and county. Chair Kokubun added the general population was also included. Representative Chong further clarified that the plan will set forth the benchmarks with which the state will be graded. Chair Kokubun agreed.

Brad commented if there is a need to categorize what kind of agriculture in the newly added indicators—there are many types of agriculture and some are not sustainable. Karl commented that another way to look at it could be in terms of productivity rather than just acreage. Chair Kokubun suggested keeping the indicators but conducting further research to make sure it can be measured.

Representative Chong suggested removing “science and engineering” from the indicator measuring the number of post-secondary science and engineering students. Keith Rollman commented that if science and engineering is removed the measurement is too general and it is an indicator used everywhere in the world for growth industries. Pamela also commented that we should use the same indicators as benchmarks if we want to compare our State with the rest of the world. Beth has no objections to leaving the indicator as is as long as post-secondary education is being addressed in another goal. Chair Kokubun suggested keeping the indicator as is. Members agreed.

Chair Kokubun proceeded on to the revisions to Goal 3. He also reminded the task force that he would like to review the entire document by the conclusion of this meeting.

Strategic Actions:

All revisions in Goal 3 were from ENV:

1. Reduce reliance on carbon-based fuels.
 - Require energy efficiency in all new private and public buildings.
 - Develop schedule to retrofit public buildings with energy efficient practices.
 - Improve energy efficiencies and options in transportation.
 - Locally produce and use of bio-fuels.
 - Adopt building codes with “green building” technology.
 - Review and revise price structures for energy use.
2. Conserve water.
 - Reduce water consumption.
 - Require greater use of recycled water.
 - Achieve increased conservation by means of education and incentives.
 - Review and revise price structures for water use.
 - Require all sewage treatment plants to use tertiary treated water.

- Require water conservation plans from large private users.
4. Provide greater protection for land-, fresh water- and ocean-based habitats.
 - Incorporate the values and philosophy of the *ahupua'a* resource management system as appropriate.
 - Establish adequate funding for invasive species control and native ecosystems protection.
5. Better manage lands to conserve agricultural, open space and conservation lands and resources.
 - Create compact patterns of urban development.
 - Integrate smart growth concepts in land use and community planning.

Pamela commented on the first strategic action that the general public is more familiar with the term “fossil fuels” than the term “carbon-based” and if it means the same thing, fossil fuels should be used or revise as follows: “Reduce reliance on fossil (carbon-based) fuels.” Task force members agreed.

Members agreed to revise the bullets under the first strategic action as follows. Revise the second bullet to read: “Increase energy efficiency in private and public buildings, including retrofiting.” Delete the third bullet. Revise fifth bullet to read: “Encourage the production and use of locally produced bio-fuels.” Add “to encourage” in place of “with” in the sixth bullet. Remove the last bullet.

The task force continued discussion on the second strategic action and corresponding bullet points. Representative Chong requested clarification on “Reduce water consumption,” understanding that it means conservation, but based on what model. Members provided examples such as low flush toilets, low flow shower heads, xeroscaping, etc. Jane suggested combining bullets 1 and 3. Keith Kurahashi suggested combining bullets 1 and 3 to read: “Reduce water consumption by means of education and incentives.” Keith Rollman suggested adding “and production” to the second bullet after “use.”

Keith Kurahashi commented that the fifth bullet addresses the concept of encouraging water conservation by setting a price structure on a per capita use and the rate increases if more water is used. Chair Kokubun suggested the following revision: “Establish price structures for water use that encourage conservation.”

Task force members were unsure of the meaning and intent of the sixth bullet and were also unclear what was being measured. Members agreed to delete the sixth bullet. Chair Kokubun requested more clarification on the seventh bullet.

Task force members agreed with the revisions made to the fourth strategic action and corresponding bullet points, except that “adequate” be deleted from the fifth bullet.

Chair Kokubun suggested deleting “Better manage lands to” from the fifth strategic action and begin the statement with “Conserve.” Member agreed to the suggested revision and also with the revision in the first bullet. Representative Chong requested clarification on “smart growth.” Keith Kurahashi responded that the idea behind smart growth is planning communities with services within walking distances or having roadways connected rather than leading to dead ends and cul-de-sacs. Representative Chong inquired if the task force, as a group, will endorse smart growth. Pamela had concerns that “integrating” smart growth concepts (referring to the second bullet). Chair Kokubun suggested revising the second bullet to read: “Encourage “smart growth” concepts in land use and community planning.” Members agreed.

Indicators:

- Percentage of renewable fuels produced locally.
- Percentage of functioning native and diverse forest cover.
- Percentage of functioning natural ecosystems ranked as very good, good, fair, poor.
- Levels of chemical, nutrient, sediment content of fresh water and nearshore marine systems.
- Introduction rate of invasive species.
- Proportion of natural systems with severely/significantly impaired natural functions due to pollution, conversion, over-use, and/or invasive species.
- Proportion of healthy and abundant fisheries.
- Proportion of healthy and functioning coral cover.
- Rate of coastal erosion, shoreline loss.
- Water level in streams and aquifers and recharge rate of aquifers.

Task force members commented that “renewable fuels” and “alternative energy” are two different things and agreed to have the first indicator revert back to its original statement, but use “percentage” instead of “proportion.” Karl suggested adding two more indicators addressing growth in annual VMT (vehicle miles traveled) and percentage of total trips that are non-motorized (traveling by bicycles or walking). Bill suggested adding the indicators in Goal 4. Representative Chong suggested another measurement to consider could be population density. Chair Kokubun commented that the intent of the fourth indicator was to address threatened and endangered species habitat—statement is too broad and needs to be qualified. Chair Kokubun also added that the eighth indicator should read: “Percentage of perennial streams on each island meeting in-stream flow standards; percentage . . .” Bill suggested that he will review the nine new indicators and determine whether they are relevant and easy to understand. The task force agreed.

Chair Kokubun continued discussion on the strategic actions and indicators of Goal 4.

Strategic Actions:

²³KM; ²⁴EDAH; ²⁵KM

1. Strengthen social safety nets.

- Develop dedicated funding sources for elderly housing and social services.²³
 - Increase high school graduation standards and high school graduation rates.²⁴
4. Strengthen public education.
- Increase awareness of and competency in financial literacy and asset building²⁵.

In the first strategic action, second bullet, Representative Chong clarified if it should be health “care” instead of health “insurance.” Members agreed that it should be healthcare. Representative Chong and Senator Tokuda had concerns with dedicated funding in revision 23. Chair Kokubun suggested the following revision: “Ensure access to elderly housing, long-term care, and appropriate social services.” Representative Chong and Senator Menor had concerns with graduation standards in revision 24. The task force agreed to delete graduation standards.

Karl suggested adding under the second strategic action a new bullet to improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Members had no objections to the addition.

Representative Chong expressed concern with identifying specific programs in the first bullet of the fourth strategic action—P-20 and Gear-up. Task force members agreed that the first bullet should be reworded to address support of educational initiatives from early childhood through high school. Members had no objections to revision 25.

Indicators:

²⁶BLC; ²⁷EDAH; ²⁸KM:

- Commute time for residents.²⁶
- Percentage of students meeting higher high school graduation standards.²⁷
- Number of partnerships dedicated to funding sources for elderly housing and social services.²⁸

Bill commented on adding Karl’s earlier suggestions for measuring growth in annual VMT and percentage of total trips that are non-motorized. The task force had no objections to revision 26. Pamela suggested deleting the revision 27 since it was deleted in the strategic action. Representative Chong suggested adding another indicator to measure car pooling (rideshare). Members agreed. Pamela suggested adding another indicator to measure home ownership. The task force agreed to delete revision 28.

Chair Kokubun proceeded on to the revisions to Goal 5.

Strategic Actions:

All revisions to Goal 5 are from KM:

1. Honor Kanaka Maoli culture and heritage.
 - Ensure the existence of and support for public and private entities which further the betterment of Kanaka Maoli.
 - Increase fluency in Kanaka Maoli language.
 - Sponsor cross-sector dialogue on Kanaka Maoli culture and island values.
 - Protect Kanaka Maoli intellectual property and related traditional knowledge and biological diversity.

3. Enable Kanaka Maoli and others to pursue traditional Kanaka Maoli lifestyles and practices.
 - Provide Kanaka Maoli mentors with opportunities to pass on Hawaiian culture and knowledge to the next generation of Kanaka Maoli and others.
 - Perpetuate Kanaka Maoli food production associated with land and ocean traditions and practices.

The task force agreed to define and use the term Kanaka Maoli instead of Native Hawaiian. Senator Tokuda requested clarification on the last bullet point under the first strategic action. Chair Kokubun responded that it address the bio-prospecting issue. Pamela suggested that it be defined. Chair Kokubun asked the Kanaka Maoli group for clarification. Representative Chong suggested that the fourth bullet be kept but delete “and biological diversity.” Task force members agreed.

Bill clarified that the revision to strategic action 3 was to make it more inclusive by adding “and others.” There were no objections from the task force with the revision to the third strategic action and also adding a fourth strategic action to address subsistence-based businesses and economies.

Indicators:

- Number of laws enacted that protect Kanaka Maoli intellectual property and traditional knowledge, cultural expressions, art forms, natural and biological resources and site-specific areas including language, dialects, place names and resource practices.
- Number of community programs and projects that promote Hawaiian culture, knowledge, traditions and practices through the means of the Hawaiian language.

Chair Kokubun suggested that Bill review the additional indicators for relevancy and understanding. Bill agreed.

Chair Kokubun entertained a motion to approve the draft of the goals, strategies, and measures as amended. Beth Tokioka moved to approve the draft; Pamela Tumpap seconded the motion. The copy of the goals, strategies, and measures as amended will be forwarded to the task force prior to the next meeting scheduled for September 13, 2007. The task force unanimously approved the goals, strategies, and measures as amended.

- IV. Review of the Hawai'i 2050 Summit.** Due to time constraints, discussion on this agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.
- V. Report on Other Activities.** Due to time constraints, discussion on this agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.
- VI. Next Steps; Plan for Future Meetings.** The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 13, 2007 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Information on the location of the meeting will be forwarded to the task force at a later date.
- VII. Adjourn.** Chair Russell Kokubun thanked members of the task force and audience for attending today's meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.