

**Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force
Hawai'i State Capitol, Room 414
July 6, 2007
Minutes**

Members Present: Senator Russell Kokubun, Representative Pono Chong, Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland, Senator Mike Gabbard, David Goode, Marion Higa, Jeffrey Hunt, Millie Kim, Keith Kurahashi, Brad Kurokawa, Representative Colleen Meyer, Keith Rollman, Stacie Thorlakson, Beth Tokioka, Senator Jill Tokuda, Representative Ryan Yamane

Members Not Present: Representative Lyla Berg, Ian Costa, Henry Eng, Karl Kim, James Spencer, Jane Testa, Laura Thielen, Michael Tresler, Pamela Tumpap

I. Call to Order. A quorum was established and Chair Russell Kokubun called the task force meeting to order at 1:26 p.m. on Friday, July 6, 2007, at the Hawai'i State Capitol in Room 414. Introduction of task force members.

II. Review and Approve of Minutes. The June 12, 2007 minutes is being prepared, and Chair Kokubun deferred action on the minutes to the next meeting on July 25, 2007.

Chair Kokubun asked task force members if there were any objections to having discussion on Agenda Item VI. Report on Other Activities first then proceed on with Agenda Item III. Review and Approval of Goals, Strategies and Measures. No members objected.

III. Review and Approval of Goals, Strategies and Measures. Dr. Kem Lowry presented a revised draft of the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Agenda, which included suggestions from task force members. The team is still working on four issues, some of which have been incorporated into the draft—how to best express that the agenda is an action-oriented instrument, focused on goals to reflect community input, authority for action, and accountability.

Chair Kokubun opened discussion on the vision statement of the draft Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Agenda. Chair Kokubun commented that the fact that we are an island culture should not be lost and we shouldn't be afraid to set high goals for Hawai'i, although it may seem unrealistic. Keith Rollman agrees with the Chair. Keith Kurahashi favors the language presented in the vision statement. Beth Tokioka suggested adding language addressing connectivity to the world globally. Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland had some concerns with the phrase "isolated island chain." Hawai'i is physically isolated but connected to the outside via various ways, for example, the internet. Representative Pono Chong agrees with Keith Kurahashi that Hawai'i should strive for greater self-

sufficiency, but has concerns with being 100 percent self-sustainable. He also added that the vision statement should address that Hawai'i is part of United States and would receive assistance from the U.S. government should the need arise and that the plan needs to sustain itself in a good and bad economy. Brad Kurokawa commented that the vision mentions "recycling and waste-to-energy processes" but he did not see that in the summary of community input.

Task force members reviewed Goal 1 and its strategic actions and indicators. Chair Kokubun asked for clarification on the development of the indicators. Kem responded saying that the indicators were developed to reflect each goal and not the individual strategic action. The indicators were also expressed on a per capita or per user basis so the data could be compared from year to year. Bill Kaneko added that various source documents were used to develop the indicators. He further commented that some of the strategic actions and indicators in Goal 1 seem redundant to Goal 3 but clarified that Goal 1 focused on the behavior of individuals, households, and government. Goal 3 focused on the supply or type of fuels produced.

Keith Rollman commented that some of the technologies listed in the indicators may be non-existent in ten years. Bill commented that there will be narrative that would indicate that some of the indicators will change over time. Chair Kokubun commented that in previous discussions on the agenda, it was noted that the strategic actions were developed for a shorter timeframe and that the strategic actions and indicators would be updated over time. Keith Kurahashi commented that it should be clearly stated that the plan is a living document and can be modified.

Millie Kim liked the idea of attitude and awareness highlighted in the second indicator. Success of the plan will depend on attitude and conduct, the idea of giving up conveniences, sacrifice, and willingness to pay more fees or special taxes.

Keith Kurahashi questioned if elementary schools were purposely left out of the first indicator. Many elementary schools participate in various sustainability programs such as recycling.

Representative Chong commented that the indicators will drive the strategies and they need to be very clear and tied to the strategies and other indicators that other agencies have already collected. For example, hybrid cars, is that the best tool to measure imported oil for gasoline for vehicle use and is it contradictory or similar to the goal of reduction of carbon emissions. Is there a list of indicators that has already been published? Kem responded that there are several lists—the Office of Environmental Quality Control collects environmental-related indicators, the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Children's Project at the University of Hawai'i, Department of Health, etc. Representative Chong further added that we should see what data is out there, which components should be combined in the plan and will lead us where we want to go.

Jeffrey Hunt had some concerns with the last two indicators. He is uncomfortable with the issue of hybrid cars because it is too current and will be outdated fast. Instead we need to address the reduction of petroleum-based products. The last indicator regarding recycling should address a reduction of waste generated—the reason we recycle is to reduce waste. Repackaging is another form of reducing waste.

Kem commented that one of the challenges faced was developing a plan that was not a government responsibility but the shared responsibility of government, businesses, and households. The intent of the indicators was to encourage action by the community and not concentrate only on government or business action. There are many ways the community can save energy. For example, hybrid car or solar unit purchases are household behaviors that are forms of saving energy.

Keith Kurahashi commented that, at first glance, there seemed to be a lot missing from Goal 1, but saw they were addressed in the following goals. Many of the indicators that he thought would appear in Goal 1 appeared in subsequent goals. He suggested that members take a few minutes to review all goals, strategic actions, and indicators then continue discussion.

Representative Chong requested clarification on the headings for each goal—A Way of Life, The Economy, etc. Bill responded saying Goal 1 focused on consumer behavior (demand) and how to reflect it in tangible activities. For example, do we purchase hybrids or cars that use renewable fuels, do we purchase solar water heaters, or are we saving water? Goal 3 focuses on the production side. Representative Chong added that these goals would fall under the “pillars”—Environment, Natural Resource, etc. Bill commented that the task force will decide on the number of indicators—Oregon has 92 indicators. Is the reader able to read through 92 indicators or whatever the number of indicators the task force decides on. Representative Chong commented that when he reads the agenda, it should be very clear that it will support the overlying goal of sustainability.

Jeffrey supports the number of indicators presented in the agenda and although we may be accused of leaving things out, he prefers having a smaller number of indicators. Representative Colleen Meyer prefers that the indicators not be so specific, for example, hybrid cars—in five years, hybrid cars may not be the energy savers we thought it would be.

Chair Kokubun asked task force members to comment on the strategic actions and indicators for Goal 2. Kem commented that the development of this goal was difficult because tourism and the military are such mainstays of the economy, and for the last four decades the goal has been to have a more diversified economy and Goal 2 expresses some actions that point us in that direction. Chair Kokubun clarified that the development of the goals and strategic initiatives reflect the input from the community engagement meetings.

Keith Rollman commented that private venture capital is not mentioned in this goal. Kem responded that the first strategic action addresses that issue but may be too vaguely stated and needs to be revised.

Representative Chong does not agree with the second indicator that if you have more scientists and engineers, the economy is better. Kem responded that the intent was to develop knowledge-based industries. Knowledge-based industries have the potential for big returns throughout the economy, not just with regards to engineers and scientists, but the employment of other workforces, such as the people who would build the hardware used by the engineers and scientists. Representative Chong added that if the intent of the task force is to select the industry that is key to our economy in the future, so be it, but believes the task force was not designed to “pick the winner.” Keith Rollman commented that the indicators will change and that something needs to be measured. Representative Chong further added that how will the goals be reached in 2050 if they keep changing. The goals should be somewhat global, if it is to get us to a sustainable future. Chair Kokubun commented that the goals may not necessarily change, but the indicators could change. Chair Kokubun clarified if Representative Chong believed that the second indicator was too specific and would rather have a more general “knowledge-based” type. Representative Chong responded in the affirmative. Jeffrey agreed and suggested using a percentage of college graduates of total workers. He is uncomfortable with indicating that scientists and engineers are more important than for example, city planners. Task force members suggested using college graduates or college degrees as an indicator.

Senator Mike Gabbard suggested using post-secondary institutions instead of local universities in the sixth strategic action.

Chair Kokubun recognized members of the audience for comments. Tom Smythe commented on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) efforts. There may be a value in keeping more “homegrown” engineers in Hawai‘i to produce sustainable products for Hawai‘i instead of making products to export elsewhere. Kirsten Baumgard Turner suggested having the indicators on a more comprehensive level so you can have a more general measurement and the indicators should last over time. Also, when looking at the indicators, keep in mind the point of the goal. Richard Morris suggested having an indicator that addresses homelessness.

Chair Kokubun opened discussion on Goal 3. Beth Tokioka suggested that the second strategic action should offer something other than just recycling. Representative Chong noted that “conservation” is not mentioned in any of the strategic actions or indicators. Kem commented that conservation is like a sub-objective. For example, there are many conservation tools that could be used to reduce water consumption. The “how to” has not been specified yet, but conservation would be part of that. Millie liked the connection between the strategic action of reducing water consumption and the indicator measurement being percentage of treated wastewater reused. In recent conversations with the county water manager, he said the efforts should not focus on just conserving

water but the idea of recycling what we have. Chair Kokubun clarified that Representative Chong's concerns regarding conservation related to energy usage.

Jeffrey suggested incorporating smart growth in the seventh strategic action. Smart growth could encompass compact patterns of urban growth. Keith Kurahashi commented that smart growth should be a separate strategic action. He feels smart growth and compact patterns are different issues and should be addressed separately.

David Goode suggested developing better indicators for government entities other than the percentage of State and county budget for the environment. Kem suggested using a percentage of personnel per thousand population. Chair Kokubun clarified Kem's suggestion of being more specific in measuring government involvement in environmental protection.

Representative Meyer commented that conservation land and watersheds involves not only government but individual action. Chair Kokubun agreed that to achieve this goal, individual action is needed, not only government.

Chair Kokubun asked Kem to clarify the intent of the last indicator, proportion of streams that are impaired. Kem responded that it reflects the fact that we are losing a lot of our streams—Maui once had 16 perennial streams and now has one.

Beth suggested adding an indicator addressing the percentage of land in various categories such as agricultural, open spaces, and conservation. If our goal is to preserve our lands for future generations, we should keep track land in these categories to assure that they are not shrinking.

Stacie Thorlakson commented if Goal 3 would be the proper place to mention utilizing environmental materials for infrastructure. For example, in Washington they will use rubber asphalt, which is supposed to reduce noise pollution and is better than the regular asphalt.

David commented on the need for an indicator for the last strategic action, research and prepare for rising sea levels and consequent coastal erosion because it is already happening.

Mark Fox, a member of the audience, commented that he did not see a strategic action addressing the care and management of our natural systems—forests, streams, rivers, and coastal areas—so they remain healthy and functioning; and with respect to sustainability, delivering the services we depend upon from them. He suggested a strategic action that would state: care for and manage natural systems, e.g. forests, river, streams, reefs, oceans, so that they are healthy, functioning, and productive.

Chair Kokubun continued with discussion on Goal 4. Kem commented that one of the top concerns of the community, improving public education, is not reflected in a strategic

action and they are still trying to develop one or two initiatives that would address this issue.

Representative Chong is unsure of how the goal fits into the overall plan. Chair Kokubun responded that the definition of sustainability is based on the triple-bottom line—economy, environment, social well-being—but there wasn't specific areas where aspects of healthcare, education, housing, and other “quality of life” issues could fall under. All these “quality of life” issues could be captured under this goal. Representative Chong questioned how bus ridership fits in. Chair Kokubun responded it addresses the community's concerns with traffic congestion. Keith Rollman suggested using “public transportation” instead of “bus.”

Keith Kurahashi noted that there is no indicator for the strategic action, identify and prioritize State and county public infrastructure “crisis points” that need fixing and suggested using CIP expenditures for public infrastructures as a form of measurement. Representative Chong voiced concerns on the relevance of fixing infrastructures to social issues. He added that although infrastructures are important, infant mortality rates, access to healthcare, or homelessness may be better indicator for social issues. Chair Kokubun commented that he believes that this strategic action also addressed traffic congestion and the highway systems. Kem added that prior discussions talked about sewage line breaks, extreme congestion in some areas, over-crowded schools and hospitals, and other public institutions that we depend on. Representative Ryan Yamane had concerns that if you add the indicators suggested earlier, then harbors, airports, repair and maintenance of schools, and other public transportations should be added; but where do you draw the line.

Representative Meyer commented that there is no action on the strategic action to decrease high school drop-out rates. How do you decrease drop-out rates? Chair Kokubun responded that the indicators are a gauge over time, so how much progress is being made from your starting point.

Chair Kokubun referred back to comments made on public infrastructure. Chair Kokubun commented that he believes the task force agrees that there are public infrastructure needs, and how can we frame it. Representative Yamane agreed that there is a need to address public infrastructure, but unsure of how to encompass it all. We should look at what the State, counties, and federal governments are doing to improve infrastructure. What would be the monitoring gauge—percentage of projects completed? If members are in agreement that public infrastructure needs to be a strategic action, Chair Kokubun suggested that, for now, focus on education and public health. Bill commented that this goal is the hardest one because it is so broad, but the goal seeks to eliminate “key” social imbalances. Fixing the public education system is crucial but that is the responsibility of the Department of Education. From a sustainability stand point, what are those one or two strategic actions that will “tip it” for us. High school drop-out rates focuses on one component in public education that would enable us to have more graduates and hopefully more responsible citizens. The rationale behind the fourth strategic action was that there is no comprehensive State and county list that identifies

and prioritizes infrastructure in need of repairs. Chair Kokubun acknowledged that the key words in this strategic action is “identify and prioritize.” Chair Kokubun asked if members were in agreement with that aspect of the strategic action. Representative Yamane agreed but added his concerns that if a key island receives the majority of goods through a small boat harbor that is not being repaired and prevents a fuel barge from entering, that could affect a person’s quality of life in terms of transportation and health issues rather than education issues.

Keith Kurahashi suggested encouraging State and county governments to practice the process of sequencing. Sequencing targets the improvements according to need. For example, first on the list is health and safety items and they would get funded, next on the list is recreation items, and so forth.

Representative Chong still expressed concerns that the strategic actions did not reflect the goal statement of eliminating key social imbalances. Senator Jill Tokuda agreed that goal statement may need to be reworded—readers may not know what “key social imbalances” are.

Jeffrey suggested using positive language, for example, instead of saying decrease high school drop-out rates, use increase high school graduation rates.

Senator Gabbard suggested adding a strategic action to increase financial literacy and asset management. Many in the community are not knowledgeable about credit use, banking, predatory lenders, etc.

Senator Tokuda would like the issues on early childhood education and long-term care be considered in this goal.

Representative Chong inquired how the plan will be utilized. The purpose of the plan and how we use it will have an impact on what is put into it. Chair Kokubun asked if discussion on his concerns could be deferred to later in the meeting. Representative Chong agreed.

Chair Kokubun suggested addressing the issue of homelessness as an indicator.

Representative Yamane commented that language should be broad rather than specific. If the language is too specific there is a greater chance that it would be outdated quicker.

Chair Kokubun entertained task force members’ comments on Goal 5. Keith Rollman believed that the task force agreed to add “island cultures” to the goal to indicate our contemporary fusion of cultures, but none of the strategic actions and only one of the indicators refers to that. Task force members noted following strategic actions and indicators they thought reflects the idea of island cultures: second and third strategic actions, third and fourth indicators. Keith Rollman added that those actions and indicators could be seen as addressing island cultures but feels there should be a separate action to address the issue.

Senator Tokuda commented that prior discussion also suggested addressing the issue of self-determination or self-governance, but it doesn't appear in Goal 5 or in the vision statement. Bill responded that the issue is addressed in the first strategic action. Senator Tokuda stated that the strategic action seemed to refer to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands or Office of Hawaiian Affairs. There are certain words used when referring to self-governance. She recalls that reference to the movement would be recognized and supported in the vision statement since it is not a goal.

Chair Kokubun commented that they will seek input from Native Hawaiians on Goal 5.

Chair Kokubun continued discussion on Goal 6. Representative Yamane commented that all the indicators were related to food, but there are other indicators for natural disasters—shelter, water, etc. You can have indicators like number of residents who have hurricane-proof homes or number of new buildings that follow the new international building code. Kem acknowledged that the indicators are incomplete. John added that they will seek input from FEMA and civil defense on other natural disaster indicators.

Keith Rollman suggested rewording the fourth indicator to read “percentage of locally-produced energy” because there are a lot of others ways to produce energy than just growing it.

Representative Chong commented again that the goal is not matching the strategy of the indicators. He agrees with the goal and indicators but they should be under a different heading. Also, there are downsides to being too self-reliant. What if we have a natural disaster, we will need the help from outside resources. Chair Kokubun commented that he believes that the goal was not geared to address only natural disasters, but also the community spirit of resiliency and perpetuation. Kem further commented that that was the intent of the goal but also an “anticipated wildcard” for events like hurricanes, bird flu, pandemics, etc. Representative Chong clarified that the intent of the goal was in the event of these natural disasters, how does the community bounce back or ride it out.

Representative Yamane suggested adding an indicator on the number of healthcare providers in ratio to the population. In times of natural disaster, we would need to rely on a variety of healthcare providers, such as nurses, to help with the potential needs of the community.

Representative Chong expressed concerns about being 100 percent sustainable. If there is another hurricane which damages processing facilities, we may want to import goods from elsewhere. He believes sustainability means options.

Representative Meyer commented that individuals themselves need to make provisions in case of natural disasters, such as hurricane kits, potable water, etc.

Chair Kokubun asked Bill and Kem to clarify why Goals 1 and 6 were presented as separate goals. Goal 6 seems to emphasize natural disasters which give reason to the

concerns of Representatives Chong and Yamane. Kem responded that the intent of Goal 6 was to address the anxiety of potential futures that cannot be predicted.

Beth commented that if Goal 6 is eliminated, the issue of food crops and food production needs to be addressed elsewhere. Senator Tokuda suggested addressing the issues in Goals 1 or 3. She also commented on the reason for the indicator on seafood catch for local consumption. Was it to address increasing aquaculture? Bill clarified that that indicator came about because most of the indicators address food crops and land-based crops.

Chair Kokubun asked members if they agreed with incorporating the strategic actions and indicators of Goal 6 into Goal 1 or other goals. Members agreed. Senator Tokuda suggested having a “going forward” section to inform readers that if the goals are achieved, we can become a more resilient, driving community.

Stacie commented that there may be occasions where events not thought of as natural disasters may become a disaster, for example, recent fires on Maui. These occurrences should be addressed also.

IV. Update on the Hawai‘i 2050 Summit. Chair Kokubun deferred discussion on the update on the Hawai‘i 2050 Summit and moved to agenda item V.

V. Review and Approval of the Recommendations from the Accountability Work Group. The Accountability Work Group (AWG) was created to look at the implementation and accountability aspects of the plan. The group met five times over the past couple months. Senator Norman Sakamoto, Mark Fox, and Representative Kirk Caldwell presented to the task force the recommendations of the Accountability Work Group. The work group’s report was distributed to members.

Mark Fox informed members that the AWG looked at other sustainability plans—Oregon and San Francisco—and how they measured on a regular basis and whether they were achieving their goals. One of the features they liked in these plans was the report card system used in determining if goals were achieved. The group also looked at other entities in the State that had some kind of influence on actions taken by government, businesses, etc.

The AWG presented five recommendations to the task force for consideration.

1. Creation of a Sustainability Council
2. Scope and Function of the Sustainability Council
3. Dedicated Funding Source
4. Attached Agency
5. Periodic Review and Audits

The first recommendation creates a governing entity to coordinate, implement, and measure Hawai‘i’s sustainability activities. The work group recommended that the

governing entity be similar to the Hawaii Tourism Authority (HTA). The work group also proposed guidelines for the composition and nomination of Council members and recommended establishing an interim board.

The second recommendation proposes the scope and core functions of the Council and the creation of advisory sub-groups.

The third recommendation proposes to select a dedicated source of funding to ensure adequate resources to implement the plan.

The fourth recommendation proposes that the Council be administratively attached to a government agency such as the Office of the Auditor or the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism.

The last recommendation proposes that the Council be periodically audited to determine the progress in implementing the plan.

Representative Yamane inquired on how much money is needed to fund the Council on a regular basis and what would its fiscal impact be. He also expressed strong concerns on using HTA as a model for the Council. He explained that the HTA board determines how they will spend their budget. The legislature determines the cap the HTA can spend and not how they spend it. The legislature and counties makes requests to the board to consider projects which relate to tourism. Recently, through the efforts of Senator Kim, improvements have been made regarding the transparency of the process of their expenditures. He also had concerns with the Council being exempted from the procurement code.

Millie commented that she once sat on the Tourism Authority Board for the Big Island and clarified that the descriptions on the bottom of page 1 and top of page 2 are true but only apply to 10-15 percent of the total money and program at the tourism authority. The other 85 percent of the dedicated funding goes toward marketing contracts. She believes that there needs to be a governing body which has dedicated funding which should come from the TAT.

Representative Chong inquired on the role of the Council and what it is supposed to accomplish. Senator Sakamoto responded that the role of the Council would be to monitor and ensure the implementation of the plan. Representative Caldwell added that the purpose of the Council is to ensure that the goals that are set are carried forward to the year 2050. The Council needs to be able to function in governmental, economic, and global changes.

Millie clarified her earlier comments that parts of HTA's structure is a good model but not as a whole. She also inquired if the work group's discussions on the function of the Council included enforcement or penalty issues. Mark responded that the group discussed incentives but did not see the Council as a regulatory body.

Representative Yamane commented that if the Council is allowed to give incentives, will it function like HTA where it will employ civil service employees, provide grants and fund projects relating to goals in the sustainability plan. His understanding from earlier discussions was that the purpose of the Council is to give input, suggestions, and assist in reaching the plan's goals by the year 2050. Chair Kokubun responded that the primary function of the Council is to issue a report card to see if progress is being made and report to the public if the benchmarks are not being reached.

Mark commented on Representative Yamane's concerns saying that there was much discussion by the group on the basic structure of this organization or body, should it be public, private, quasi-public, or quasi-private. They looked at functions they thought the task force would like this body to perform, like measuring and reporting on the success or progress on achieving the goals. The work group also felt that functions of this body should also extend beyond the issuing of report cards and assessing progress. The group looked at other functions performed by the private sector or quasi-government sector, like advocacy or partnering. This body, with their expertise in sustainability areas, could approach the legislature and suggest tax incentives to those who support the efforts of sustainability. The group saw the potential of this body to become more pro-active in reaching the plan's goals. The HTA was looked at as a model primarily because of the maturation of their organization and their functions on product development, product enrichment, and natural resource programs. Millie commented that this body would be similar to a lobbying group in its fullest form. Mark responded that that could be a possibility. Senator Sakamoto added that this body would not only advocate to government but also to the private sector and community.

David agrees that report cards, advocacy, and potential projects are needed but another aspect to look at is reminding government administrators, legislators, and council members on a daily basis that this effort is important. There needs to be something more that drives government to continually think of sustainability when they prepare their budgets or enact new laws.

Beth suggested that there be at least two representatives from each neighbor island. She sees some potential problems with the governor selecting from the list of nominees and feels there should be diversity in the membership of the Council.

Jeffrey commented that he is uncomfortable with the Council being a regulatory board. He also commented that 15 members may be too big and suggests reducing the membership to 10.

Bill addressed Representative Chong's earlier question on what happens once this plan is completed. The bottom line for the AWG was who does this go to—government, DLNR, DBEDT, Office of Planning, or to private industry, non-profit, not-for-profit created to implement the plan? The group discussed the pros and cons of each and agreed on a quasi-entity which the group is presenting to the task force. The group's intent was to give this body the powers, authority, and duties to implement the plan, but have a private sector feel—the latitude and flexibility to act expeditiously, react to market changes, and

empower citizens. Another aspect was the need for this body to be credible so that when it issues report cards, for example, government and business leaders take notice.

Representative Meyer commented that she feels uncomfortable with this since no legislation has been passed and it is already being decided who sits on this Council and how they will be selected. Chair Kokubun clarified that the AWG is presenting their recommendations to the task force and no decisions have been made.

Chair Kokubun informed task force members that decision on the recommendations of the AWG will be made at the next task force meeting. Chair Kokubun summarized the concerns of the task force on the recommendations presented by the AWG.

Recommendation I: reduce number of members to ten, ensure diversity in membership, neighbor island representation, governor's role in selecting from a nomination list, no legislators from current task force on interim board.

Recommendation II: how is implementation to occur, advocacy role.

Recommendation III: budget amount, sources of funding.

Recommendation IV: perceived conflict if attached to the Office of the Auditor (auditor not allowed to audit legislature, office considered attached to the legislature).

Recommendation V: appropriate agency to perform the audit, offer suggestions for time frame period review and audit.

Chair Kokubun thanked Senator Norman Sakamoto, Representative Kirk Caldwell and Mark Fox for their presentation and reminded members that the July 25th meeting is an important meeting where decisions will be made on the AWG's recommendations.

- VI. Report on Other Activities.** A summary of the March 8, 2007 meeting of the Business Leadership Council was distributed to task force members. Jeanne Schultz Afuvai reported that on March 8, 2007, 35 business leaders met to give their input on the sustainability process. A second meeting is scheduled for July 24, 2007. The business leaders were asked to report on their own sustainability practices. Hawaiian Telcom was the first to respond with their inventory list of sustainable practices. The list was presented in four categories: Environmental, Economic, Social, and Cultural. A list of businesses who have sustainability practices will be posted on the Chamber of Commerce website.

Jeanne also invited task force members to the fourth Hawai'i Business 2050 Sustainability Breakfast Forum scheduled for Friday, July 27, 2007 from 7:30 to 9:00 a.m. at the Hawai'i Prince Hotel Ballroom. The topic for this forum is "Water Supply: The Silent Determinant of Growth." Guest speakers will be the Honorable Harry Kim, Mayor of the County of Hawai'i and Dean Okimoto, President of Nalo Farms in Waimānalo.

Chair Kokubun reported on sustainability efforts of the military, in particular, the Army's housing projects at Schofield and their development of energy efficient models, generation of electricity on-site, and upgrades to their wastewater treatment facilities. The presentation by Colonel Howard Killian has been posted to the H2050 website. Chair Kokubun introduced Kirsten Baumgard Turner, who is the Sustainability Planner contracted by the Department of Defense. Congress has tasked the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence to carry out the Sustainable Installations Initiative and has selected Hawai'i as the pilot site for sustainability and strategic planning.

The telephone survey, conducted by SMS Research, will be completed by the third week of July. The results of the survey will be shared with the task force.

Two editorials which appeared in the Sunday, June 17, 2007 edition of the *Honolulu Advertiser* were distributed to members. Chair Kokubun noted an editorial published in the Sunday, July 1, 2007 edition of the *Honolulu Advertiser* that asked the Governor not to veto H.B. No. 1270, which appropriates funding for the continued efforts of the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force. Chair Kokubun proposed that the task force, as a whole, send a letter to the Governor asking her not to veto H.B. No. 1270. The Chair entertained a motion to submit a letter to the Governor asking her to reconsider vetoing H.B. No. 1270. Jeffrey Hunt moved to submit the letter and Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland second the motion. The task force unanimously approved the motion to submit a letter from the task force to the Governor asking her to reconsider vetoing H.B. No. 1270. Stacie suggested that the letter be printed on recycled or green colored paper.

Chair Kokubun, Bill, and Jeanne met with representatives of the native Hawaiian community. The meeting was organized by Leimomi Kahn, President of the Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs and Walter Heen, Office of Hawaiian Affairs Trustee.

- VII. Next Steps; Plan for Future Meetings.** The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 25, 2007 from 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Members will be notified of the location of the meeting when confirmed.
- VIII. Adjourn.** Chair Kokubun thanked task force members and the audience for their participation at the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.