

**Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force
Hawai'i State Capitol, Room 414
November 13, 2007
Minutes**

Members Present: Senator Russell Kokubun, Representative Pono Chong, David Goode, Marion Higa, Karl Kim, Millie Kim, Keith Kurahashi, Brad Kurokawa, Senator Ron Menor, Representative Colleen Meyer, Jane Testa, Senator Jill Tokuda, Michael Tresler, Pamela Tumpap

Members Not Present: Representative Lyla Berg, Ian Costa, Henry Eng, Senator Mike Gabbard, Jeffrey Hunt, Keith Rollman, James Spencer, Stacie Thorlakson, Beth Tokioka, Representative Ryan Yamane

- I. Call to Order.** A quorum was established. Chair Russell Kokubun called the meeting of the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force to order at 12:20 p.m. on Tuesday, November 13, 2007 at the Hawai'i State Capitol in Room 414.
- II. Review and Approve of Minutes.** Chair Russell Kokubun entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the October 16, 2007 task force meeting. Jane Testa moved to approve the minutes and Senator Jill Tokuda seconded the motion. Chair Kokubun opened discussion on the minutes. The minutes from the October 16, 2007 Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force meeting was unanimously approved by members.
- III. Discussion and Approval of the Community Engagement Report.** Janis Reischmann and Leland Chang presented a report on the community engagement meetings. A total of 627 individuals provided over 2,100 comments through one of three methods—community meetings, website, and email or other written feedback. The report is organized in two major segments. The first segment discussed comments received on the goals, strategic actions, indicators, and proposed Sustainability Council, and summarized general comments. The second segment quantified the comments received and topics they related to. Janis commented on one of her observations of the feedback received. It appeared that many people did not read the draft plan and their comments indicated more of what they hoped was in the plan. Janis also commented on the numeric tallies applied to each comment. The numbers were not scientifically developed, but indicated the number of times a comment was made, regardless of the length on the comment. For example, a comment made on the composition of the Sustainability Council that is either one line or a paragraph would each received one tally mark. Leland also added that previous community engagement comments were prioritized and straw polling was conducted. When someone made a comment, others were able to “weigh-in” on the comment which would result in larger “counts.” The tallies represent the number of times the comments received through all three feedback mechanisms. Leland commented that he and Janis had the opportunity to participate in post-report drafting and were pleased to see that much of the community’s concerns are reflected in the plan.

Chair Russell Kokubun thanked both Janis and Leland for an outstanding work in compiling the comments received not only in the latest round of community engagement but throughout this entire process and also noted the value of the information presented. Pamela Tumpap inquired if Janis or Leland saw anything different from previous community engagement. Leland responded that out of 2,100 comments, two comments said the plan was horrible but a majority of the community felt the plan was something they could work with. Janis added that she was somewhat surprised at the number of comments made on the Sustainability Council. The community generally agreed with the idea of having a council but had many comments on its composition, structure, and authority. Senator Jill Tokuda asked for clarification on the tally number for each of the goals. Janis responded that the tally number represented the number of general comments made on each goal, for example on page 28, 44 people commented that they like goal 3, thought it should be a top goal, and believed environment is the economy. Leland commented that generally people were satisfied with the five goals presented with the exception of wanting education to be its own goal. Pamela Tumpap questioned if somewhere in the plan it is or will be mentioned that the goals and strategic actions are in no particular order or prioritized ranking. Leland responded that they had not considered the implications of numbering the goals—if not, they would have used alphabets or other symbols. Janis added that there were a few people who reacted to the notion that there was a hierarchy to the numbered goals. Chair Kokubun commented that the implications of prioritization is an important point to address because there were also comments that the goals seemed to appear as separate silos and no integration and interaction between the goals. Leland also shared comments some people made that the plan does not say enough about the trade-offs and sacrifices needed to be made to achieve these goals.

Karl Kim shared his recent experiences in Korea at the meeting of the International Congress of Local Governments for Sustainable Development (UN organization). This is a world-wide movement and he believes that we are ahead of the curve from many other places but behind in some respects. One of the things that came out of the sessions was that the successful places had a lot of community engagement and metrics to measure engagement. The task force seems to be moving in the right direction but he feels that we are not quite there. Karl commented that engagement is really important as well as the indicators. Janis commented on the concerns the public had on the Sustainability Council—some thought the idea was to “hand over” Hawai‘i’s future and sustainability to the 15-member Council, which scared some; while on the flip side, people thought the Council should be about engaging the people and insuring momentum and moving forward. Karl commented that we do auditing from an economic perspective but maybe we should look at environmental or engagement auditing—how do you capture or measure participation and engagement. Leland commented that people want to continue to be engaged and kept “in the loop” and how to that happens moving forward would be through a conscious thought process of the Council. Pamela commented on previous discussions on the appearance of the goals to be in silos and that could be said too of the organizations that provide input on the plan—there needs to be some kind of integration among the various organizations. Chair Kokubun commented that he receives requests daily from schools and students, organizations, community groups, etc. to take part in

discussions on the sustainability efforts and encouraged task force members to be part of a “speakers bureau” to go out to these organizations and continue the dialogue. On behalf of the task force, Chair Kokubun thanked Janis and Leland for their assistance to the task force.

Chair Kokubun entertained a motion to accept and approve the Community Engagement Report. Pamela Tumpap moved and Millie Kim seconded the motion to accept and approve the report. Chair Kokubun entertained further discussion on the report. The task force unanimously accepted and approved the Community Engagement Report.

IV. Update of the Web Survey. Jim Dannemiller of SMS Research presented an update of the web survey. He first noted that at the bottom of each graph there should have been a note that stated: “The score is based on the rankings of 341 individuals who filled out the website survey.” The survey did not seek detailed characteristics of the individuals who responded, but they appear to be aware or associated with the activities of the task force. Respondents to the web survey were asked which goals and strategic initiatives they felt were most important and which ones the task force should address first. Jim noted that the statistics emphasize the “difference.” For example, the top bar on the graphs only indicate that *most*, not all, respondents ranked that indicator as most important and most respondents ranked the indicator with the shortest bar lower among the other indicators. Respondents were asked to use an 1, 2, 3, etc. ranking, although some used other creative methods such as “all should be ranked #1.” The results seem to reflect the same concerns presented in the Community Engagement Report.

Pamela Tumpap inquired if the results of the web survey are being correlated with the comments made at the community engagement meetings. Bill Kaneko responded that the results were looked at independently but simultaneously. Jim added that he wasn’t sure how meaningful it would be to have the results tied together. Representative Pono Chong inquired if respondents were asked to provide statistical information such as zip code, age, or income. Jim responded that respondents were asked very little questions such as which county they resided in. Karl Kim asked what the differences are between a web-based survey and a random-type survey. Jim responded that the web survey should be used as a tool. Karl also inquired if there were any differences between the web survey and the general population. Jim believes there are more similarities than differences. Millie Kim commented that Jim did not seem comfortable with the total number of respondents (341) to the survey. Jim responded that a good number of would have been at least 400 respondents, but 341 is fine and he had no problem with it. Senator Jill Tokuda inquired why Goal 3 was broken into two groups. Jim responded that since individuals respond better to shorter lists, Goal 3 was broken into two parts. Senator Tokuda commented that the priorities identified in the web survey seem to be consistent with the Community Engagement Report and inquired if the web survey will continue to collect input from the public. Bill responded that the web survey could remain on the website for the public to respond to.

The web survey asked three questions regarding the sustainability plan: 1) Do you agree with that broad way of planning, or do you think the plan should just be for lawmaking?,

2) Do you think this “triple bottom line” is the right way to go, or do you think the plan should focus on one or two of the three items?, and 3) Which one should be stressed? Most respondents, 84.8 percent, agreed that it should be broad; 9.7 percent felt it should be for lawmaking. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents also agreed that the plan should focus on all three items, 17.6 percent felt that the plan should focus on just one or two of them, and 3.5 percent felt the plan should focus on something else. Jim cautioned that the results of third question probably do not represent the consensus of the general public but more on individual interests. Representative Pono Chong commented that that could be one of the dangers of a web survey—one person could ask all of his/her friends who share the same philosophy to participate in the web survey which could result in data that is not statistically random. Jim believes that no one did that because he did not get that type of response back.

Participants of the web survey also responded to four questions on the proposed Sustainability Council: 1) Do you think having a permanent Sustainability Council is a good idea?, 2) Do you agree with a 15-member Council?, 3) Do you agree with the composition of the Council?, and 4) Do you agree that the Council will be funded by an existing funding source? Three quarters (75.7 percent) of the respondents agreed that there should be a permanent Sustainability Council; 14.7 percent did not agree. Fifty-one percent agreed on a 15-member Council, and 36.1 percent did not agree. Seventy-three percent of the respondents did not agree that eleven of the 15 members be appointed by the governor and the county mayors appoint one each of the remaining four members. Only 19.1 percent agreed with the proposed composition. As for the Council being funded by an existing funding source; 60.7 percent agreed, 24.3 percent disagreed, and 14.1 percent didn't care.

- V. **Update of Public Opinion Poll #2.** Jim Dannemiller informed members that analysis of the telephone survey data has not been completed and results are unavailable. He did share preliminary analysis which is based on 1,520 people. There was a high number of participation even though some were not aware of the plan and those who did not know of the plan still believed it was a good idea. Jim commented that in the previous survey, participants on all islands shared the same concerns and priorities, but the results are beginning to differ by island. Jim commented that this could be a result because of a couple of things: 1) participants were asked to provide more detailed opinions and 2) take into consideration the when or the period of time that the survey was being taken.

Jim provided preliminary statistics on question asked of participants in the telephone survey.

Do you feel the pace of development is too fast, too slow, or okay?
Too fast=47% Too slow=10% okay=38%

Do you agree that agriculture should be improved and how? About 50 percent statewide responded that we need to do anything we can to assist improving agriculture. However, on the neighbor islands most favored the idea of producing small independent family farms.

How do you feel about diversifying the economy?

In favor=70%

Not in Favor=15%

don't care=15%

Seventy percent of the respondents felt the community should become involved in government decisionmaking.

If things were to change from what there are now, would you like to see the power shift to the state, county, other entity, or keep it the same as it is now?

State=13%

Counties=33%

Keep the same=44%

*Of the 33% who said counties should have more power, 50% were from the neighbor islands.

In Hawai'i, should we work towards a system where all cultures are treated equally or should there be a special place for Hawaiian culture?

Special place for Hawaiian culture=78%

All cultures treated equally=18%

Participants of the telephone survey were asked questions on the Sustainability Council similar to those asked on the web survey.

Do you agree with the creation of a Sustainability Council? 75% agreed, 24% disagreed

Do you agree that 11 of the 15 members shall be appointed by the governor? 40% agreed, 45% disagreed

Do you agree that 7 of the 15 members shall be from the neighbor islands? 70% agreed, 15% disagreed

Do you agree that the Sustainability Council should be funded through an existing funding source? 60% agreed, 25% disagreed

Final results of the telephone survey should be completed in a couple of weeks.

- VI. Update on Stakeholder Meetings.** Bill Kaneko reported that in addition to the Community Engagement Report, web survey, and telephone poll, another method to receive input on the plan is to meet with stakeholders. HIPA staff and task force members met with various stakeholder groups.

Bill summarized the meeting held with the Community Services Providers. The plan was well received by the groups. There was general agreement on Goal 4 and believed it was comprehensive but wanted other areas addressed—crime and violence, parenting, mental health. They also asked that the task force consider adding another strategic action addressing the strengthening non-profit sector. The group was strongly in favor of a Sustainability Council.

The Business Leadership Council meeting was a “spirited” meeting with a number of business leaders in attendance. The council wanted the task force to focus on two major areas—affordable housing and public education and creating a quality workforce. There was much discussion on what will it take to create affordable housing. When discussing

the issues of affordable housing, business leaders felt other areas needed to be addressed: living wages and providing higher paying jobs; diversified economy; and infrastructure. There was also a lot of discussion on the Sustainability Council and much concern that it would be just like any other government entity and potentially lead towards more regulation. Representative Colleen Meyer commented that more than one councilmember voiced concern that funding the Sustainability Council through existing special funds was not the route to go and should be funded by general funds. Keith Kurahashi commented that the Leadership Council felt the Sustainability Council should be a non-profit agency and they also wanted more details and specificity on the goals.

A meeting was also held with members of the labor sector and they shared many of the same concerns as other stakeholders—affordable housing, diversified economy, carrying capacity and infrastructure, and public education.

Bill informed task force members that Kanaka Maoli groups were satisfied with initial rounds of meetings with them and elected not to meet again. Bill also contacted the environmental groups and Mark Fox emailed his group for additional comments and one was received.

The format for the meeting with the education group was somewhat different from the other stakeholder meetings in that it focused more on ways to engage our youth rather than seeking input from educators. To continue youth engagement in this effort, the group suggested having a Sustainability Day during the upcoming 2008 legislature. They also suggested providing a program where the youth are able to track one or two bills relating to sustainability through the legislative process. A follow-up meeting is planned for November 7th to discuss next steps. Senator Jill Tokuda suggested contacting Hawai'i State Student Conference and Hawai'i State Student Council. They will present their own legislative package to the legislature and are very interested in the sustainability efforts but unfortunately were unable to attend the Summit. The Student Council represents middle and high school students from public and private schools.

Senator Tokuda is working with Sharon Miyashiro in coordinating a meeting on sustainability for college students, faculty, and administration which will be similar to the community engagement meetings held throughout the state. The meeting is being held on December 6th from 11:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. at the Campus Center Ballroom. Task force members are invited to attend.

- VII. Discussion and Approval of Draft Plan Revisions.** For discussion, Recommendations to H2050 Report Draft 1.0, was distributed to members. Chair Russell Kokubun suggested using the handout as an outline for discussion. Bill Kaneko outlined the recommended changes suggested at the community and stakeholders meetings.

Structural and Formatting Changes

- Place the plan up front and engage the readers sooner. Also clean-up the process section and have it follow the plan.

- Include an Executive Summary, no more than 3-4 pages.
- Add a new section or provide greater details on implementations. The year 2050 is more of a vision than a plan. Very strong and consistent feedback from the community and stakeholders was received that a “next steps” section was needed for the year 2020 which included more details, targets, timelines, and fixed responsibilities.

For discussion, HIPA provided a proposed “Next Steps” section. Presented were eight issues that resonated with the communities and ranked them in prioritized order.

1. Affordable housing
2. Public education
3. Energy use and production
4. Recycling
5. Diversifying our economic base
6. Fixing our infrastructure
7. Sustainability ethic
8. Aging community

There was a need to address all modalities of affordable housing—for purchase, rental, single- and multi-family. And along with that, strong policy shift for compact urban development and smart growth. Representative Pono Chong questioned the validity of 140% of median income. Bill responded that that figure has always been in the plan. Chair Kokubun added that many have voice concern with that being the target and would like to see a wider range. Keith Kurahashi commented that there was a range in the draft plan. Chair Kokubun responded that the plans states “up to 140%” but many only read it as 140% and not the range. Representative Chong had some concerns with using the word “Providing.” Bill provided the original language in the draft plan, “Review and increase affordable housing opportunities . . .” Pamela Tumpap suggested using “Increasing” in place of “Providing.”

A strong concern voiced was to strengthen public education, before pre-school to higher education and beyond, to create a quality workforce and develop responsible and productive citizens. Chair Kokubun commented that prior discussions on education in its broadest sense, but here we are specifically targeting public education. David Goode recalled that in prior discussions, it was agreed that public education would be targeted rather than public and private education. Task force members agreed. Pamela commented that concerns voiced by the community were to improve the public education (DOE) system.

The community wants to see a shift from fossil fuels to renewable energy. Keith Kurahashi reviewed the eight issues and noticed that Kanaka Maoli was not one of the issues addressed and recommended that it be added as number 3. Chair Kokubun

suggested deferring this matter until later and continue with the recommendations presented. Keith Kurahashi agreed.

Representative Chong clarified if energy was addressed only in the environment goal or was it also addressing in the economy goal. Bill responded that it was addressed only in the environment goal. Mike Tresler commented that as part of a feasibility study, energy use and production is a huge economic driver so it could be seen as more economical than environmental. Pamela commented that this issue goes back to prior discussions that the goals need to be integrated better and not presented in silos. Pamela added that the interrelationship between the goals needs to be shown. As the plan is now, the goals are presented as economy goals, environmental goals, etc., but may be they should be presented just as prioritized goals. By reading the goals, the individual would be able to see that the goal related to the environment. Brad Kurokawa commented that to justify why these goals are part of the plan, they all pass a “triple-bottom line” test, having the elements of economy, environment, and social well-being. Bill commented on the difficulties in presenting the plan two-dimensionally and suggested using graphics to show the interrelationship between the goals. Pamela commented that it is important to show the linkage between the prioritized “next steps” goals to more than one goal. Chair Kokubun reminded members that these are “intermediate” goals or steps which reflect the plan and integrate the goals. Representative Chong apologized for his misunderstanding of the prioritized “intermediate” goals. The goals seem to be short-term goals (for 2020) but his thought was for example, if you want to be 70 percent food sustainable in 2050, then by the year 2020, we want to be 50 percent—gradually achieving the goal. Bill responded that that could be done but if you look at the plan, there are more than 50 goals and realistically we would not be able to do all 50. Karl Kim commented that this seems to be a good idea and addresses the issue of implementation. While working on the University plan, he looked at about 50 plans across the country and Kentucky was able to reduce their plan into a “commitment card.” These cards could be carried in your wallet and would list the various benchmarks. The card would provide a quick overview of what the plan was about and the entire plan could be accessed at a website. Karl acknowledges that it is difficult to narrow things down to what are the common elements of each goal. He believes the general intent of the idea is good. Keith Kurahashi agreed that this is a good start but feels there should also be some secondary goals beyond the eight prioritized goals. He agrees with Representative Chong that more frequent benchmarks are necessary and suggested starting at 2015 and every 5 years thereafter. Chair Kokubun believes that the “big picture” is not being lost. How the plan is written is really important. Chair Kokubun added that it is difficult to project goals for 2030, 2040, or 2050, but this is sort of a “kick start” for the first 10 years and then the body, however established, would be responsible for revisiting the plan every five years. Keith Kurahashi commented on the need to understand that this is a living plan and some of the goals may need to be adjusted. As he mentioned in previous meetings, he hopes the goals are measured per capita.

Senator Jill Tokuda commented that she likes this format because it provides the general public with top priorities to look at. The task force has looked at this document for the past two years and are familiar with the goals and strategic actions; and some may think that it is not specific enough, but to the average person, this document could be overwhelming. She would like to see 10 priorities listed and believes Kanaka Maoli and food sustainability should be added. Mike commented that action is needed now. There are businesses that are currently practicing or working towards sustainability but legislative support is needed. Chair Kokubun reiterated that the plan needs to be clear, easily understood, actionable; and asked that the task force continue with these intermediate steps but not lose the contents of the 2050 vision. Kirsten Baumgard Turner shared the army installation's experiences in their planning process. She supports Pam's point on having the long-term vision. The Army's long-term mission statements are their goals, then they develop objectives within the timeframes being used to achieve those goals. An implementation plan is created from actions necessary to achieve the objectives within the timeframe.

The fourth issue was increasing recycling statewide by providing incentives and necessary resources and tools for the counties to do so.

Diversifying our economic base, both from an agriculture standpoint as well as supporting sustainability-related industries, was a top priority voiced.

Fixing our infrastructures was not a high priority with the community but with the stakeholders. The stakeholders would like a state/county study conducted on assessing, prioritizing, and costing infrastructure needs.

Another top priority was creating a sustainability ethic. Everyone must do their part in creating a sustainable Hawai'i—public sector, private sector, government leadership.

To address concerns from community services providers, caring for our aging community with long-term care financing, services, and infrastructure was listed as a top priority.

Bill commented that these recommendations are HIPA staff's efforts in addressing comments made by the community and stakeholders on the draft plan and are opened for task force discussion and revision. Pamela commented that she agrees with the priorities presented. Chair Kokubun suggested that to address Senator Tokuda's concerns that food production was high on the public's interest list, we consider including food production in the intermediate goal addressing diversifying our economic base. Keith Kurahashi commented that in supporting diversified agriculture, you could recommend buying local products or it could be added to sustainability ethic by teaching the community to purchase local products. Senator Tokuda commented that food production has become a top priority and that it warrants its own intermediate goal. Pamela commented that it also has to be

measurable. Based on their priority ranking, Pamela asked HIPA what priority would be next on the list. Bill responded workforce development would have been the next but it was included in public education. Chair Kokubun concluded from previous discussions that the task force agrees with the eight recommended priorities or intermediate goals and would like to add food production and Kanaka Maoli culture and include narrative on how these goals relate to the triple-bottom line.

Bill commented that the next step would be to research indicators that have already been established by departments or by statute, determine if goals are realistic, and determine who would be the responsible agency for each goal. Jane Testa suggested that it be implied that the lead agency is a collaborative effort and not just the responsibility of one department.

- Better linkage between strategic actions and indicators. Bill explained that some of the indicators may link up to an indicator and others may not. Janis Reischmann commented if the indicators are a result of collective action (work that is being done in several strategic actions at the one time) or indicators for each strategic action (which could result in indicator overload and perception of not being inter-connected). At the implementation level there would be accountability by having performance measures for strategic actions and activities to move the actions forward. Leland Chang recalls that at the community meetings, people suggested indicators for the task force's consideration but they did not say that each strategic action should have a certain amount of indicators. Janis added that as mentioned earlier, when you have indicators you need to have a benchmark and a target for performance. Karl commented material things are easy to measure but when measuring economy it gets more complicated because you are not looking just at growth, and it becomes very difficult to measure something like adopting an ethic. There are some thing we can achieve right away and others that will be a work in progress. Representative Chong suggested having a caveat that mentions that the plan is constantly evolving and will change.
- Provide a better explanation of the inter-dependence and inter-connection between the five goals.
- Make introduction sections for each goal more interesting and informative by using graphs and data.
- Include a paragraph or subsection on population growth and carrying capacity and how the plan addresses it. Representative Chong recommended as a reference the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism's 2030 Plan. The 2030 Plan is not actually a plan but an assessment of general demographics.

The Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Plan

- No changes to the definition.
- Revise vision to make it more aspirational and less stiff.

- The guiding principles will remain the same.

Way of Life

- Provide greater emphasis on youth involvement, participation, and education
- Emphasize responsibility of all sectors to create a preferred and sustainable Hawai‘i.

The Economy

- Elaborate on local agriculture and food production component to possibly include related infrastructure, water irrigation, etc. Representative Chong recommended including language relating to economic viability in the strategic action.
- The business community suggested making the footnote become a strategic action to address the need for more sustainability-related and knowledge-based industries. Chair Kokubun asked members if there were any objections to removing the footnote and including the same language in the narrative. Representative Chong had concerns that by including the footnote in the narrative, sustainability-related industries are then limited to those four. Keith Kurahashi commented that if the language “include, but not limited to” is kept, it would address Representative Chong’s concerns.
- Provide a better explanation as to why tourism and military are included in the plan by clarifying the need to diversify these mature sectors and make them more sustainable.

Environment and Natural Resources

- Strengthen activities in the section on energy independence.
- Strengthen activities in the section on recycling. Beth Tokioka sent an email suggesting that strategic action #3 be expanded beyond recycling to include reduce and reuse.
- Add strategic action for government purchasing sustainable products. Chair Kokubun commented that another strategic action should be added as long as it is framed within the context of setting a standard or example. Bill also suggested that this could be included in the sustainability ethic intermediate goal.
- Address broader water issues, not only water conservation. Pamela commented on the need to mention development of future water sources and infrastructures and maintenance of the water infrastructures. Senator Ron Menor commented that water system infrastructure is addressed in Goals 2 and 4. Senator Tokuda commented that the issues may be in the wrong place and should be in Goal 3. Chair Kokubun suggested looking at the Board of Water Supply’s Sustainable Water Plan.
- Strengthen discussion on global warming activities.
- Include discussion on air quality and environmental mapping component.

Community and Social Well-Being

- Elaborate and highlight role of education as it relates to various aspects of the plan.

- Expand “traffic congestion” to include public transportation, including the role of business, commerce, and smart-growth development.
- Add a strategic action to address strengthening the non-profit sector and also address the issues of crime and violence and the role of parenting in the educational spectrum.

Karl Kim commented that there is a need to strengthen the language of increasing our resiliency in terms of natural hazards.

Kanaka Maoli and Island Values

- Better explain and highlight definition of Kanaka Maoli.
- Enhance the continuation of Kanaka Maoli and island cultural values.

Jane commented that many of the concerns heard regarding the use of the term Kanaka Maoli came from Hawaiians. Pamela also heard those comments and clarified if the term is widely accepted and who decided it is widely accepted. Chair Kokubun suggested going back to the stakeholder group to clarify the use of the term.

Sustainability Council

Communities and stakeholders generally were in favor of establishing a council but had concerns with the council’s composition and duties. The business leadership group had concerns that the council would be another layer of government and suggested it be administered by the private sector or non-profit organization. Chair Kokubun clarified that the business group saw the layer of government as regulatory versus advisory and explained that the council could help formulate policy but would have no authority to mandate regulation.

Senator Menor shared concerns from the Mililani community that the council would be better served if attached to the Office of State Planning instead of the Office of the Auditor. Chair Kokubun mentioned a suggestion made by Senator Tokuda to increase the membership to 25 and have this task force become a “transitional” council. David agreed with some members carrying over to the council but not everyone. Pamela commented that she first supported a smaller membership but will support increasing membership to 25 since a major comment from the community was for broader representation. Chair Kokubun commented that one major obstacle in having a council with 25 members is establishing quorum for meetings. Representative Colleen Meyers suggested having subcommittees on each island that work with the council. Keith Kurahashi suggested having non-voting members. Marion Higa commented that other task forces that her office administers are smaller and has an easier time establishing quorum. Millie Kim favors a smaller membership with advisory groups. Chair Kokubun suggested keeping the membership to 15 members and include ex-officio non-voting members from DBEDT, DLNR, DHS, DOA, OSP and DOE. Members expressed concerns with identifying the departments included as ex-officio non-voting members since all departments have direct or indirect links to the implementation of the plan. Karl commented that he believes a major function of the council would be to gather

information, publicize the information, and keep the public together moving forward. He does not see the council as a regulatory entity.

Keith Kurahashi suggested including only DOE and OSP as ex-officio non-voting members instead of having all department heads attend meetings. OSP could be responsible for coordinating with other departments to address issues being discussed. Senator Tokuda commented that the neighborhood boards have governor's cabinet representatives responsible for relaying information to the appropriate agency for action. Representative Chong inquired how the Council would implement the plan. Chair Kokubun responded that the council would be responsible to report whether the plan has been implemented and/or the indicators have been met, and not force, mandate, or require that things be done.

Chair Kokubun asked members if there were any objections to keeping the membership of the council to 15 members and include the Department of Education and Office of State Planning as ex-officio non-voting members. No objections from members. Chair Kokubun then inquired if there were any objections to the composition of the council. Representative Meyer commented that she would not be in favor of having more than seven members from the neighbor islands since the majority of the population is on O'ahu. Bill commented that the draft plan proposes six members, one each appointed by the governor, county mayors, and OHA. The remaining nine members would be appointed by the governor considering their expertise in one or more of the areas listed, with four of the nine members residing in each of the four counties. Keith Kurahashi commented that there would be at least six neighbor island representatives but could be more if the other five (from the nine) members are from the neighbor islands. Janis asked the task force to consider island representation versus county since that was a comment raised, especially from Maui county. Chair Kokubun commented on having student representation on the council. Members suggested including a student as an ex-officio non-voting member, similar to the BOE. Chair Kokubun would like the student member to have more responsibility since it is their future decisions are being made upon. Senator Tokuda questioned any legal liability since the student is a minor. Chair Kokubun suggested Bill check with BOE on their student representative. Bill recommended adding another function for the council to promote cross-sector dialogue on key issues facing sustainability.

Chair Kokubun entertained any objections to the proposed changes to the draft plan. Representative Chong objected to the council established as a governmental entity and would like its function be to facilitate rather than implement. With no other objections, Chair Kokubun asked Bill to proceed with the proposed changes to the draft plan.

VIII. Report from the Legislative Work Group.

IX. Report on Other Activities. A draft Report on the Hawai'i 2050 Youth Sustainability Project was presented to the task force. There were 578 participants in the teen survey; results are presented on pages 10-12. The survey was taken, in part, using a touch-screen

instrument and not through KIDS Voting. Unfortunately, KIDS Voting was not used due to low public relations and marketing resulting in minimal responses.

Jane Testa shared three recent activities on Hawai'i island that could encourage future sustainability engagement: 1) the County Council has created a Sustainability Committee as part of its council committees (not a standing committee), 2) the Department of Research and Development has redefined its Advisory Committee to the Sustainable Action Committee, and 3) the mayor has created a Sustainable Energy Commission.

Chair Russell Kokubun also mentioned that Maui County Mayor Tavarres recently convened an Energy Expo.

Millie Kim also mentioned that the Hawai'i County Council recently adopted an ordinance creating a Cultural Resources Review Commission which will inventory the island's cultural importance.

Bill Kaneko commented that originally the final plan was to be unveiled to the public in January through community engagement meetings, but from recent discussions with the community engagement team, it is recommended that the plan be unveiled in another way through public relations and instead promote a Sustainability Day during the upcoming legislative session. Jane commented that the public was told at the last community meetings that the plan would be unveiled in January at various community meetings. Janis Reischmann commented that an explanation would be needed on why no meetings were being held. Janis also commented that they tried to envision what the content of the meetings would be since the public would not be asked for their input. Although you could discuss how to advocate for the adoption of the plan or implementation strategies, it would be less substantive than prior meetings where the public was asked to craft or recraft the plan. Marion Higa commented that it would be difficult to discuss implementation strategies when the legislature has not made any decisions on the plan. Senator Jill Tokuda suggested presenting the plan at the meetings of each of the county councils where the public are welcomed to attend. The task force agreed with this approach.

- X. Next Steps; Plan for Future Meetings.** The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 14, 2007 at the State Capitol in Room 414 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- XI. Adjourn.** Chair Russell Kokubun thanked members of the task force and audience for their commitment to the efforts of the task force. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.