

Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs
State of Hawaii

HCR 358 TASK FORCE MEETING

Date: Monday, December 8, 2008
Time: 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Place: The following State of Hawaii Video Conference Centers:

Big Island:
Hilo State Office Building
75 Aupuni Street, Basement
Hilo, HI 96720

Kauai:
Lihue State Office Building
3060 Eiwa Street, Basement
Lihue, HI 96766

Maui:
Wailuku Judiciary Building
2145 Main Street, Room 120
Wailuku, HI 96793

Oahu:
Kalanimoku Building
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room B10
Honolulu, HI 96813

Members of the public may attend the meeting at any of the specified above locations and for their convenience are asked to take note of the meeting chronology set forth in the Agenda. No food or drinks (including water) are allowed in the video conference centers.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (Chair)
2. Approve Agenda (All)
3. Accept Minutes from November 5, 2008 Meeting (All)
4. Public Testimony (Public)
5. Old Business (All)
6. Reconsider the Issue that DCCA use Rulemaking Similar to Cable Franchise Renewal (All)
7. Selection Process of Board of Directors of PEG Access Organizations (All)
8. Discussion of 1st Amendment Rights of PEG Access Organizations (All)
9. Report to Legislature (All)
10. New Business (All)
11. Preparation for Next Meeting if Necessary
12. Adjournment

Depending upon time considerations, each speaker may be limited to a specific time for public comment. Written comments may be emailed to cabletv@dcca.hawaii.gov or mailed to DCCA-CATV, P.O. Box 541, Honolulu, HI 96806, Attn: HCR 358 Task Force or faxed to 808-586-2625. Persons with special needs for this meeting may call CATV at (808) 586-2620 at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting to discuss accommodation arrangements.

**HCR 358 TASK FORCE
FINAL MINUTES OF MEETING
ACCEPTED BY CHAIR**

Date: December 8, 2008
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Place: The following State of Hawaii Video Conference Centers:

Big Island:
Hilo State Office Building
75 Aupuni Street, Basement
Hilo, HI 96720

Kauai:
Lihue State Office Building
3060 Eiwa Street, Basement
Lihue, HI 96766

Maui:
Wailuku Judiciary Building
2145 Main Street, Room 120
Wailuku, HI 96793

Oahu:
Kalanimoku Building
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room B10
Honolulu, HI 96813

The Agenda for this meeting was filed with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor.

I. Call to Order (Chair) (Meeting Rules)

A. Roll

i. Present and Vote re Report Recommendation

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1. Eric Knutzen | Yea |
| 2. Jay April | Yea (second) |
| 3. Roy Amemiya | Yea |
| 4. Shelley Pellegrino | Yea |
| 5. Gregg Hirata | No |
| 6. David Lassner | Yea, with reservation |
| 7. Geri Ann | Yea |
| 8. Gilbert Benevides | Yea |
| 9. Keith Rollman | No |
| 10. MaBel Fujiuchi | Yea (movant) |
| 11. Clyde Sonobe (arrived during discussion re recommendation) | Recuse |

ii. Excused

1. Gerald Takase

B. Approve Agenda

1. Approved as transmitted

II. Accept Minutes from November 5, 2008 Meeting (Task Force)

- A. Accepted unanimously with objection from Member April as noted in IV.A.

III. Public Testimony (Public)

A. Rules

B. Ed Coll (*see two (2) submissions of written testimony attached*)

- i. Elects to read testimony.

C. Carol Bain (*see attached written testimony*)

D. Linda Popollo

- i. Commends Task Force for progress given draft; complements members

Final Minutes
HCR 358 Task Force
December 8, 2008 Meeting

- ii. Would like to see beefier section on localism (e.g. Maui – Akaku is THE medium.
- iii. Otherwise, wonderful job. Work together to serve the public, that is where Maui is headed. Critical of DCCA given that they are not present and have missed meetings. Would like to see DCCA have standard based discretion, had riveting testimony from public, nothing ever said; DCCA should look at both sides of the coin. Encouraged for the future.

E. Keali'i Lopez

- i. Commends Task Force, keeping track was great. Re-emphasizes the need to move forward on proposing an exemption at the legislature; DCCA's adoption of proposed rules is underway, rulemaking was to follow 103D and the latest letter relating to why DCCA sees a need to make clear that there are a lot of issues that DCCA has to deal with and an exemption would make it easier for them.

IV. Old Business (Task Force)

A. None.

V. Reconsider the Issue that DCCA use Rulemaking Similar to Cable Franchise Renewal (All) (Includes Selection Process and Discussion and 1st Amendment Rights)

A. Went through draft and comments provided by DCCA, Akaku, and Olelo.

i. Intervene

1. Member April – more transparency; Chair asks about alternatives. Member April says need to err on side of caution; permits a legal proceeding; fail safe; puts “teeth” in process.
2. DCCA – intervention invites a process which could become costly and legally contentious per case hearings; not consistent with renewal process.
3. Members Lassner and Amemiya would prefer not to include “intervene”; Member Amemiya because he does not understand contested case hearings. Member Pelegrino says it is already included in the Olelo submittal re cable franchise process. Member Amemiya says not sure about standing. Member Lassner indicates that given that intervene is called out in Olelo submittal, does not object to language in recommendation.

B. Approved Recommendation (see voting results above)

- i. Based upon public input received and its own analysis of the regulatory and legislative framework, the Task Force submits the following recommendations.

(1) The Legislature should exempt the designation of PEG access organizations from the provisions of the State Procurement Code.

Final Minutes
HCR 358 Task Force
December 8, 2008 Meeting

(2) Should the designation of PEG access organizations not be exempted from the State Procurement Code, the Task Force recommends that the designation of PEG access organizations be exempt administratively from the competitive requirements of the State Procurement Code on the grounds that competitive procurement is not practicable or advantageous to the State.

(3) The Task Force recommends that in place of competitive procurement, the DCCA be charged with adopting Administrative Rules that guide a new process for the designation of PEG Access organizations in a manner that is similar to the process used by the DCCA for cable franchises, a process that is already well-understood by the DCCA and the public. This process should provide ample opportunity for input by the public on each island within the local franchise area and allow for interested parties to intervene. A sample set of draft rules is set forth for consideration as Exhibit 1.

Additionally, the Task Force has reviewed the pertinent sections of the bylaws governing the selection of board members for each of the PEG Access organizations. The Task Force notes that these organizations are required to comply with laws governing non-profit organizations and believes that the DCCA should not have any authority to require a PEG Access organization to change its board selection process as a condition to designation. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that:

(4) The process for designation of PEG Access organizations should require each PEG Access organization to provide its processes for selection of board members and any changes proposed. This will be made available for public comment and reviewed as part of the renewal process, but the DCCA should not have any authority to require that an organization's board selection process be changed.

Similarly, the Task Force has engaged in discussion regarding the first amendment rights of PEG and the expectation that non-discriminatory access be provided. The Task Force recommends that:

(5) PEG Access organizations should provide information regarding their past performance and proposed practices for ensuring that PEG Access supports the diversity of viewpoints and non-discriminatory first amendment rights of the people of the local communities they serve. This will be made available for public comment and reviewed as part of the renewal process.

Final Minutes
HCR 358 Task Force
December 8, 2008 Meeting

- VI. Report to Legislature (***approved recommendation attached***)

 - A. Provide all information exchanged during Task Force tenure. Member April to send Chair and Facilitator a copy of all submitted information for comparison. DCCA to assist in compilation and delivery of the report.
 - B. Report to be drafted by Facilitator from approved recommendation and transmitted for Task Force comments and approval.
 - C. Finalize the Report by December 20, 2008; DCCA to compile and physically submit to Legislature.

- VII. New Business
- VIII. No Additional Meeting's Scheduled
- IX. Adjourned at 4:00 pm

Memo – December 7, 2008

TO: HCR 358 Task Force, Chair: Eric Knutzen

FROM: Carol Bain, HCR 358 Task Force member

FROM: Carol Bain, HCR 358 Task Force member, Community Media Producers Association member

RE: Input for the HCR 358 Task Force:

This Task Force was asked to focus on several areas, including:

- 1) Solicit Public input
- 2) Examine methods other than the Public Procurement Code process
- 3) Ensure proper checks and balances
- 4) Examine the selection process for PEG advisory board members
- 5) Recommendations made by the task force should take into account the first amendment rights of PEG
- 6) Submit a report of suggested policy changes

If this list is not complete, please let me know.

It is my understanding both the legislature and Judge August clearly wanted this task force to define how the first amendment rights would be addressed. In my opinion, the judge wanted individual users, particularly the public's first amendment rights, taken into account. Instead, this group decided to interpret the direction as the PEG organizations rights. Though members of this task force could easily have contacted the judge for clarification on this topic, none did.

Government and Education users continue to dominate the services and resources, leaving the Public with little support. From the discussion I have heard at the few task force meetings I attended, current receivers of the sole source funding do not want checks and balances or accountability. They continue to snipe at each other, are not sincerely seeking good alternatives, and only see a threat to their personal cream stream.

Providing PEG access is not a life and death service, such as those that provide the emergency telephone (E-911) communications services in this state. Nevertheless, those service providers comply with the state procurement code and the system serves the community well. Procurement code compliance encourages competitiveness, new solutions and efficient use of technology, especially for communications-related services. The fact remains that PEG services could be provided by others and there is nothing unique about the current service providers.

Please list the number of outreach efforts, press releases, public announcements, etc. other than the website listings. Basically, unless someone was already aware of this issue and using search engines, they would not know about this task force or when and where the meetings were or how this issue may impact their lives. I commend the chair for allowing access to the minutes and for using the website, so that those who were aware could find out about the meetings.

I see this HCR358 Task Force effort as a delaying tactic so the current sole-source receivers of state-mandated access fees are allowed to continue to expend several million dollars annually with little accountability. I have been to some of your meetings and from the minutes I have read and the discussion I witnessed, this task force has not accomplished key issues above. Even so, I think this task force should submit a final report. I do not think the current task force is able to accomplish their tasks. Thank you for including my input today and my Nov. 2, 2008 input.

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR



MARK J. BENNETT
ATTORNEY GENERAL

LISA M. GINOZA
PROFESSOR OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

425 QUEEN STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII, 96813
(808) 586-1500

December 1, 2008

Mr. Eric Knutzen
Chairperson
H.C.R. No. 358, H.D. 1, Task Force
Kapui'e Building
4444 Rice Street, Suite #427
Lihue, Hawaii 96756

Dear Chairperson Knutzen,

Re: Your November 12, 2008 Letter

This is in response to your November 12, 2008 Letter that was submitted on behalf of the HCR No. 358 (2008) Task Force. According to your letter, the Task Force requests our office to review a proposed process for PEG access organization renewals that is similar to the cable television franchise renewal process, and that the proposed process be adopted by the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs ("DCCA") as an alternative to the Procurement Code ("Code") in Hawaii Revised Statutes chapter 103D. Enclosed with your letter was a description of this alternative process and draft rule amendments that the Task Force intends to submit in its report to the Legislature. You subsequently asked whether this approach can be legally accomplished, and what steps are needed legislatively or administratively to effectively complete this proposed process.

As you are aware, DCCA is in the process of amending its administrative rules to specifically state that PEG access organizations shall be designated and selected in accordance with the Code. DCCA amended its administrative rules because of the State Procurement Office's ("SPO") determination that DCCA's contracts with the PEG access organizations are subject to the Code, and Judge Joel E. August's determination that the method and criteria DCCA uses to designate and select PEG access organizations must be set forth in an administrative rule.

MARK J. BENNETT

Mr. Eric Knutzen
Page 2
December 1, 2008

Although the Task Force is properly exploring alternative methods to oversee PEG expenditures and ensure proper checks and balances in accordance with the mandate of HCR No. 258, H.D. 1 (2008), we believe that the alternative process in the Task Force's proposed rules conflicts with existing law.

We believe that the adoption of any method other than the Code to designate and select PEG access organizations requires a specific statutory amendment or authority. DCCA's proposed rule is based on and is consistent with the Code. The Task Force's proposal does not arise from any interpretation or authorization under the Code but proposes an alternative which must be provided for by statute. Thus, we believe that the Task Force must first draft appropriate legislation to accomplish the intent of its proposed process.

Accordingly, we believe that it is premature to provide comments on the specific provisions in the Task Force's proposed rules. However, we reserve our right to provide comments on these proposed rules if and when specific legislation is passed authorizing a method other than the Code.

Thank you for your letter and inquiry.

Very truly yours,

Rodney J. Tam
Deputy Attorney General

APPROVED:



for Mark J. Bennett
Attorney General

"David Franzel"
<davidfranzel@haw

aii.rr.com>

12/01/2008 08:25
PM

<roy.amemiya@centralpacificbank.com
, <gbenevides@co.hawaii.hi.us>,

<shelley.pellegrino@co.maui.hi.us>,

<Geri_Ann_Hong@notes.k12.hi.us>,

cc

<Glen.WY.Chock@dcca.hawaii.gov>,

<Laureen.K.Wong@dcca.hawaii.gov>,

<Patti.K.Kodama@dcca.hawaii.gov>

Subject

Draft

To
"'Jay April'" <jay@akaku.org>,
<keo@keoinc.org>,
<gtakase3@hotmail.com>,

<eknutzen@kauai.gov>,

"'Hirata, Gregg'"
<ghirata@honolulu.gov>,

<david@hawaii.edu>,
<krollman@honolulu.gov>,
<Clyde.Sonobe@dcca.hawaii.gov>

HCR 358 - November 5, 2008

Minutes

Task Force,

Attached are the draft minutes from the November 5, 2008 meeting. Ed Coll's testimony and Keali'I Lopez's suggested revisions (previously sent to Task Force members) are attached.

See you on December 8, 2008 at 2:30 p.m.

David. (See attached file: HCR358 Draft Minutes November 5 2008 Meeting.doc)

----- Message from "Ed Coll" <coll@kauai.net> on Mon, 3 Nov 2008

06:56:51

-1000 -----

To: <cabletv@dcca.hawaii.gov>, <eric@knutzen.se>

cc: <eknutzen@kauai.gov>, <bain@kauai.net>

Subject: Input for HCR358 Task Force

Please include the following correspondence/memo for the Nov. 5, 2008 meeting:

Memo - Monday Nov. 2, 2008

TO: HCR 358 Task Force, Chair: Eric Knutzen cabletv@dcca.hawaii.gov

FROM: Community Media Producers Assn., Vice President: Ed Coll
coll@kauai.net

RE: Input for the HCR 358 Task Force:
--qualifying criteria for organizations providing PEG services in Hawaii

The Community Media Producers Association has researched and followed the procurement issue with regard to PEG Access television over the years. It is understood that the source of the funds is derived from state-mandated franchise fees. It is further understood that, other than a small administrative cost, these fees are to be used solely for public, education and government access services. This CMPA is aware the State Procurement Code and process may not be applied, and if the open bidding process will be replaced, then a new process must be defined.

Because the services delivered by potential providers have freedom of speech implications, criteria should be established.

This is a request for the HC R358 Task Force to require any potential contract recipient for PEG Access services in Hawaii to be a membership-based, nonprofit organization and comply with State Law Chapter 414D Hawaii Nonprofit Corporations Act. Also in their bylaws, compliance with open meetings and records are to be defined. To elucidate key points, please consider the following governance criteria and oversight recommendations:

- > a. offer annual, publicly noticed, open elections for electing a minimum 7-member board using standard, fair nominations and elections practices (elected, not appointed, directors)
- > c. define a member as any user of Public or Education or Government access in the service area who pays a one-time, nominal \$1 fee and provides and maintains an updated U.S. mailing address (annual membership drives/outreach documented)
- > d. require candidates for the board to also be members

f. require elected board members to complete a training within their first year after election on the importance of the voluntary application of open records and open meetings for membership-based nonprofit organizations and the bylaws that follow these principles (not just the "spirit" of sunshine, but actual compliance)

e. require the PEG access organization conduct an annual member satisfaction survey for feedback on the effectiveness of their freedom of speech services (make document public)

f. specify procedures and processes to ensure first-come, non-discriminatory access to the public channel

g. require that personnel, equipment and services paid for by franchise fees shall be used solely to fulfill the scope of services of that DCCA contract

Regarding government access, if a funded entity is to provide government access services only, then all funds received should be applied to that scope of services, and not diverted to other purposes. The equipment purchased and staff paid for by state-mandated franchise access fees may not be used to compete against other production companies for any other contracts. In others words, the entire sum received must be applied to freedom of speech services and not diverted to other purposes.

If a funded entity is to provide public, education, and government access services, then equal resources will be expended equitably for each. Annual, independent audits are recommended.

It is recommended that the DCCA or local County (whichever is designated) to continue to require an annual report on the fairness the election procedures and effectiveness of freedom of speech services provided. This awarded contract and any subsequent reports should be public documents posted on the DCCA website.

(See attached file:
Proposed_Regulations_PEG_access_designation_KLopezEdit.doc)

<HCR358 Draft Minutes November 5 2008
Meeting.doc><Proposed_Regulations_PEG_access_designation_KLopezEdit.do
c>

David Franzel

From: Patti.K.Kodama@dcca.hawaii.gov on behalf of cabletv@dcca.hawaii.gov
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 11:38 AM
To: eknutzen@kauai.gov; David@davidfranzel.com
Cc: Glen.WY.Chock@dcca.hawaii.gov; Clyde.Sonobe@dcca.hawaii.gov; Laureen.K.Wong@dcca.hawaii.gov
Subject: Fw: Ed Coll short form Input for the HCR 358 Task Force

Ed Coll <coll@kauai.net>

To cabletv <cabletv@dcca.hawaii.gov>

cc eric <eric@knutzen.se>

Subject Ed Coll short form Input for the HCR 358 Task Force

12/08/2008 09:59 AM

CMPA
1658 Liholiho #506
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

808 239-8842

Memo -- December 8, 2008

TO: HCR 358 Task Force, Chair: Eric Knutzen

FROM: Ed Coll, , Community Media Producers Association member

RE: Input for the HCR 358 Task Force:

Aloha Task Force members,

A Plain reading of page 1 line 3 - 4 "PEG" is defined as "public, education, and government (PEG)", not "public, education, and government access organizations (PEG)". The legislature meant free speech rights of PEG "sectors" not the free speech rights of PEG "entities". Clearly the legislature meant this Task Force should take the first amendment rights of the public, educational institutions, and government agencies into account, not " (s)"?? It appears that unless somethings occurs in this final TF meeting the TF has chosen to ignore both their legislative mandate and Judge August's strong suggestion to not exclude the first amendment purpose of PEG Access.

12/8/2008

Public exercise of First Amendment speech was the congressional intent for public access when they passed the 1984 Cable Rights Act and has been the central concern of CMPA for over twenty years, and yet this issue continues to be ignored and violated by practices such as block programming.

Please correct this multi-year error now by including the following language in your final report;

The Task force recommends the following contractual language to assure the first amendment rights of Hawaii citizens;

1. The service provide shall provide first-come, nondiscriminatory access for the public on designated public access channel(s).
2. The service provider shall specify the rules, methods, and processes that will be used to assure first-come nondiscriminatory access.

Mahalo Ed Coll

David Franzel

From: David Franzel [david@davidfranzel.com]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 8:57 AM
To: 'Jay April'; 'keo@keoinc.org'; 'gtakase3@hotmail.com'; 'roy.amerniya@centralpacificbank.com'; 'gbenevides@co.hawaii.hi.us'; 'eknutzen@kauai.gov'; 'shelley.pellegrino@co.maui.hi.us'; 'Hirata, Gregg'; 'Gerl_Ann_Hong@notes.k12.hi.us'; 'david@hawaii.edu'; 'krollman@honolulu.gov'; 'Clyde.Sonobe@dcca.hawaii.gov'
Cc: 'Glen.WY.Chock@dcca.hawaii.gov'; 'Laureen.K.Wong@dcca.hawaii.gov'; 'Patti.K.Kodama@dcca.hawaii.gov'
Subject: FW: Input for Dec. 8 HCR358 Task Force

Task Force,

Just received

David

From: Patti.K.Kodama@dcca.hawaii.gov [mailto:Patti.K.Kodama@dcca.hawaii.gov] **On Behalf Of** cabletv@dcca.hawaii.gov
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 8:00 AM
To: eknutzen@kauai.gov; David@davidfranzel.com
Cc: CATV-Staff@dcca.hawaii.gov
Subject: Fw: Input for Dec. 8 HCR358 Task Force

bain@kauai.net <bain@kauai.net>

12/07/2008 03:26 PM

To: cabletv <cabletv@dcca.hawaii.gov>
Cc: eknutzen <eknutzen@kauai.gov>
Subject: Input for Dec. 8 HCR358 Task Force

Memo – December 7, 2008

TO: HCR 358 Task Force, Chair: Eric Knutzen

FROM: Carol Bain, , Community Media Producers Association member

RE: Input for the HCR 358 Task Force:

This Task Force was asked to focus on several areas, including:

- 1) Solicit Public input

12/8/2008

- 2) Examine methods other than the Public Procurement Code process
- 3) Ensure proper checks and balances
- 4) Examine the selection process for PEG advisory board members
- 5) Recommendations made by the task force should take into account the first amendment rights of PEG
- 6) Submit a report of suggested policy changes

If this list is not complete, please let me know.

It is my understanding both the legislature and Judge August clearly wanted this task force to define how the first amendment rights would be addressed. In my opinion, the judge wanted individual users, particularly the public's first amendment rights, taken into account. Instead, this group decided to interpret the direction as the PEG organizations' rights. Though members of this task force could easily have contacted the judge for clarification on this topic, none did.

Government and Education users continue to dominate the services and resources, leaving the Public with little support. From the discussion I have heard at the few task force meetings I attended, current receivers of the sole source funding do not want checks and balances or accountability. They continue to snipe at each other, are not sincerely seeking good alternatives, and only see a threat to their personal cream stream.

Providing PEG access is not a life and death service, such as those that provide the emergency telephone (E-911) communications services in this state. Nevertheless, those service providers comply with the state procurement code and the system serves the community well. Procurement code compliance encourages competitiveness, new solutions and efficient use of technology, especially for communications-related services. The fact remains that PEG services could be provided by others and there is nothing unique about the current service providers.

Please list the number of outreach efforts, press releases, public announcements, etc. other than the website listings. Basically, unless someone was already aware of this issue and using search engines, they would not know about this task force or when and where the meetings were or how this issue may impact their lives. I commend the chair for allowing access to the minutes and for using the website, so that those who were aware could find out about the meetings.

I see this HCR358 Task Force effort as a delaying tactic so the current sole-source receivers of state-mandated access fees are allowed to continue to expend several million dollars annually with little accountability. I have been to some of your meetings and from the minutes I have read and the discussion I witnessed, this task force has not accomplished key issues above. Even so, I think this task force should submit a final report. I do not think the current task force is able to accomplish their tasks. Thank you for including my input today and my Nov. 2, 2008 input.

Carol Bain

12/8/2008

David Franzel

From: Jay April [jay@akaku.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2008 8:49 PM
To: David Lassner
Cc: Eric Knutzen; David Franzel; Shelley Pellegrino; keo@keoinc.org; gtakase3@hotmail.com; Roy Amemiya; Gilbert Benevides; Gregg Hirata; Geri Ann Hong; krollman@honolulu.gov; Clyde Sonobe
Subject: Re: Final Report Language


HCR358draftV3.d

oc (39 KB)

David and Task Force Members,

I have a correction. In recommendation #5 we did not delete DIVERSITY OF VIEWPOINT as your draft suggests. Per Chair Knudsen's suggestion we did delete DIVERSE MEMBERS and replace it with the word, "PEOPLE" in order to avoid repetition of the word "diverse" precisely because we left DIVERSITY OF VIEWPOINT in. I think all the other language is correct but I will review the electronic record to verify. Thanks for all your hard work.

On Dec 8, 2008, at 3:58 PM, David Lassner wrote:

> Here's what I believe we approved today.
>
> david
>
>
>
> <HCR358draftV3.doc>

David Franzel

From: Jay April [jay@akaku.org]
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2008 8:46 PM
To: David Lassner
Cc: David Franzel; Eric Knutzen; Shelley Pellegrino; keo@keoinc.org; gtakase3@hotmail.com; Roy Amemiya; Gilbert Benevides; Gregg Hirata; Geri Ann Hong; krollman@honolulu.gov; Clyde Sonobe
Subject: Re: Final Report Language

David,

I guess it is the formatting of changes to the document on my email that was confusing. Never a problem with lower case, lower case is fine as is "to intervene"

You crack me up dAvid Lassner! Have a nice WeEkeNd!

Jay

On Dec 12, 2008, at 7:59 PM, David Lassner wrote:

> Jay -- If you want to insist on the syntax "TO INTERVENE" rather than
> "to intervene" then that's fine with me. My change was solely to use
> lower case, just as with "diversity of viewpoint."

> I'm not sure that the tape will provide clarification of whether your
> favored phrases all need to be in upper case in the final report, but
> I'm sure you'll find that reference if it's there. I'm comfortable
> with whatever case our Chair and Facilitator decide to use.

> Case aside, it appears to me that this language is in fact not
> consistent with the sample rules. The sample rules provide only that
> the applicant (PEG entity) may petition DCCA for a contested case
> review hearing. As I understand the language that was inserted, it
> appears that you wanted to make sure that any interested party could
> intervene including a disgruntled member of the public or aspiring
> alternative provider. That should be a lot of fun for everyone.

> bEsT, dAvid

> On Dec 12, 2008, at 7:14 PM, Jay April wrote:

>> David,

>> I believe the words TO INTERVENE were also left in item #3 consistent
>> with the sample rules. I will check electronic record on Monday when
>> it becomes available.

>> Thanks

>> Jay

>> On Dec 12, 2008, at 6:03 AM, David Lassner wrote:

>>> Correct, I replace the uppercase phrase with the same language in
>>> lower case. Here's the paragraph after markup as I believe we
>>> adopted it:

>>> (5) PEG Access organizations should provide information regarding
>>> their past performance and proposed practices for ensuring that PEG
>>> Access supports the diversity of viewpoints and non-discriminatory

>>> first amendment rights of the people of the local communities they
>>> serve. This will be made available for public comment and reviewed
>>> as part of the renewal process.

>>>
>>> david

>>>
>>> On Dec 11, 2008, at 9:36 PM, David Franzel wrote:

>>>
>>>> Jay, I think that David left diversity of viewpoint in, it just
>>>> appears in the redline as deleted because he deleted your CAPS and
>>>> substituted in the lower case.

>>>>
>>>> David.

>>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: Jay April [mailto:jay@akaku.org]
>>>> Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2008 8:49 PM
>>>> To: David Lassner
>>>> Cc: Eric Knutzen; David Franzel; Shelley Pellegrino;
>>>> keo@keoinc.org; gtakase3@hotmail.com; Roy Amemiya; Gilbert
>>>> Benevides; Gregg Hirata; Geri Ann Hong; krollman@honolulu.gov;
>>>> Clyde Sonobe
>>>> Subject: Re: Final Report Language

>>>>
>>>> David and Task Force Members,
>>>>
>>>> I have a correction. In recommendation #5 we did not delete
>>>> DIVERSITY OF VIEWPOINT as your draft suggests. Per Chair Knudsen's
>>>> suggestion we did delete DIVERSE MEMBERS and replace it with the
>>>> word, "PEOPLE"
>>>> in order to avoid repetition of the word "diverse" precisely
>>>> because
>>>> we left DIVERSITY OF VIEWPOINT in. I think all the other language
>>>> is correct but I will review the electronic record to verify.
>>>> Thanks for
>>>> all your hard work.

>>>>
>>>> On Dec 8, 2008, at 3:58 PM, David Lassner wrote:

>>>>
>>>>> Here's what I believe we approved today.

>>>>>
>>>>> david
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> <HCR358draftV3.doc>

>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>