

**Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force
Hawai'i State Capitol, Room 414
May 10, 2007
Minutes**

Members Present: Representative Pono Chong, Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland, Ian Costa, David Goode, Jeffrey Hunt, Karl Kim, Keith Kurahashi, Brad Kurokawa, Representative Colleen Meyer, James Spencer, Jane Testa, Laura Thielen, Beth Tokioka, Senator Jill Tokuda, Pamela Tumpap, Representative Ryan Yamane

Members Not Present: Senator Russell Kokubun, Representative Lyla Berg, Henry Eng, Senator Mike Gabbard, Marion Higa, Millie Kim, Keith Rollman, Stacie Thorlakson, Michael Tresler

I. Call to Order. A quorum was established to begin the meeting. Chair Kokubun was unable to attend the May 10th meeting. Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland was asked to preside over the meeting. The task force meeting was called to order at 1:17 p.m. by Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland on Thursday, May 10, 2007, in Room 414 at the Hawai'i State Capitol. Introduction of task force members and members of the audience.

II. Review and Approve Minutes. Draft minutes from the March 28, 2007 meeting was distributed to members. Also distributed was a revision to the draft minutes—agenda item VI. Update on the Accountability Work Group. Senator Chun Oakland opened discussion on the draft minutes. Representative Pono Chong clarified if the revised section was where he raised concerns about having the integration with the county and state and being too forceful. Task force members confirmed. Senator Chun Oakland asked if Representative Chong would like his comments added in the minutes. Representative Chong declined. Senator Chun Oakland entertained a motion to approve the March 28, 2007 minutes. Representative Pono Chong moved to approve the minutes; Beth Tokioka seconded the motion. The task force unanimously approved the March 28, 2007 minutes.

Senator Chun Oakland welcomed comments from the audience. Margaret Willie, an attorney and a member of the South Kohala Community Development Steering Committee, County of Hawai'i addressed the task force. Ms. Willie distributed to the task force her concerns and noted that views expressed are her own and not that of the steering committee. She shares the community's concern that with all the work being done to develop a plan, the plan should not just "sit on the shelf." There needs to be some action taken to implement the plan. Ms. Willie attended the South Kona community meeting and many of her written concerns were also expressed by others at the meeting. Senator Chun Oakland informed Ms. Willie that the task force has discussed creating an ongoing body that would have the authority to monitor implementation of the plan at the local, individual, state, and federal level.

III. Update and Discussion of Community Engagement Working Group Activities. Janis Reischmann reported that all 12 Phase II community meetings held throughout the state have been completed. Task force members who attended the meetings were asked to comment on their experiences.

Beth Tokioka reported that two meetings were held on Kaua‘i—one on a Thursday evening and the other on a Saturday morning. A very diverse group of about 20 people attended the Thursday evening meeting. Considering that the information was presented to the community for the first time, the meeting went very well. One challenge coordinators of the meetings faced was how to present the IssueBook in a manner that was stimulating and engaging and not boring. Beth believed they accomplished that. There was a lot of energy expressed at the breakout sessions. About 20 people attended the Saturday morning meeting. This group was less diverse but still very interested. Beth commented that she thought that both meetings were successful in getting more information to bring the efforts to the next level of community involvement. Janis thanked Beth for participating in both meetings held on Kaua‘i and also commented that the communities have expressed their appreciation of task force members’ attendance at various community engagement activities.

Brad Kurokawa reported on the meetings held on the island of Hawai‘i. There were approximately 30 participants at the Hilo meeting and 40 at the Kona meeting. Although there was much information presented, participants were engaged. One Hawai‘i island resident put together a really great synthesis integrating local, state, and global issues. One of the concerns voiced at the meetings was that there was so much information to be shared and not enough time to hear what others had to say. He felt that participants were very engaged in coming up with goals, strategies, and measures. Janis also thanked Brad, Chair Kokubun, and Millie Kim for attending the Hilo and Kona meetings and Jane Testa for attending the Kona meeting.

Laura Thielen attended the Kailua community meeting and shared the same comments as mentioned by the previous task force members. Responses from community members have been similar and comments have been consistent to those from other communities. Janis thanked Laura for attending the Kailua community meeting.

Jeffrey Hunt attended three of the four community meetings scheduled for Maui County. There was a lot of consistency with other communities such as environment and housing, but there were also some stark differences. For example, on Lāna‘i, discussion focused on adequate wages to continue to live on the island and the economy. On Moloka‘i, they were more concerned with the environment. One common comment was how the state plan would affect the local plan. On Moloka‘i and Lāna‘i, there may be another step—state plan affecting the local plan which would then affect the community plans. Jeffrey also echoed the comments made by others that there was a lot of enthusiasm, participation, and appreciation. Jeffrey noted that the Lāna‘i meeting should receive special merit—Lāna‘i city is a very small city and there were 125 community members present at the meeting. Thirty of the participants were from a high school class who

earned extra credit by participating. These students arrived very enthused and were very engaged in the process. It is always nice to see youths at these meetings and hear their perspective on sustainability. One student suggested preserving conversational areas—kids hang out and need a place to converse. Janis added that 50+ people attended the Moloka‘i meeting which ended after 10:00 p.m.

Pamela Tumpap added her comments on the Lāna‘i meeting stating that even those who attended the meeting were surprised at the number of people at the meeting. Pamela expressed her deepest appreciation to Alberta DeJetley, island coordinator for Lāna‘i, for the success of the Lāna‘i community meeting. She visited businesses 3 to 4 times to get them to attend the meeting and a comment from many of the participants was that they enjoyed the diversity of those in attendance, including top executives from Castle and Cooke. Pamela also commented that not only did teachers give students extra credit to attend but the teachers also attended and graded the students on their participation. This may be a good example of how to get youths involved in the process. The teachers should be applauded for getting their students engaged. It was an amazing night on Lāna‘i; the sound resonated back and forth throughout the cafeteria and everyone was really excited and engaged.

Pamela also attended the Thursday night meeting on Maui and commented that it was more subdued and the conversation quieter. Most participants were well-known members of environmental groups unlike the Saturday meeting which had more business participants. Discussions at the Thursday meeting gravitated more towards a “green” concept, whereas on Lāna‘i, the students voiced concerns on jobs, the economy, and affordable housing.

One observation Pamela shared was that there wasn’t enough time for participants to comment on the definition, vision, and guiding principles, because as participants arrived, they began interacting as they were taking their seats. And although they were provided materials and comment sheets as they arrived, interaction had already begun and in turn, the facilitators were unable to get an overview of their thoughts on those three critical pieces. Pamela commented on another observation saying that using community facilitators was good since everyone in the community knew them, but although they receive some facilitator training, they did not stop people from critiquing other people’s ideas. In a true brain-storming session, facilitators should stop people from critiquing other people’s ideas. Pamela noted that there was great participation at the meetings and those who attended were very engaged and excited about the process. She also shared Beth’s comment that the issue papers contained a lot of information and needs to be presented in a way that is easier to digest.

David Goode attended the Saturday morning meeting on Maui and commented that there was a good crowd in attendance who were very attentive and cordial. A number of youths were also in attendance.

James Spencer attended the community meeting held at Sunset Beach Elementary School on a Saturday morning. There were about 30 people in attendance at the meeting. James

commented that he was surprised by the degree to which people were thinking about sustainability. One of the issues that came up at the meeting was the degree of effort being made to integrate what the task force is doing with local planning. James also added that a number of the teachers were in attendance, as well as Gail Mukaihata Hannemann of the Girls Scouts, so discussions focused more on education, our youth, the importance of engaging multi-generations in the effort, and specific ways to promote integration. For example, teaching the process of creating a plan—the written products, reports, and strategies—in the schools and engaging them in the importance of the process as a long-term effort.

Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland attended the community meeting in Kapolei. Senator Chun Oakland commented that discussions at the Kapolei meeting were similar to that of the other community meetings where their top priorities were on the economy, jobs, housing, education, and how to engage our youth to implement sustainability practices that would lead to a sustainable Hawai‘i. The group also discussed cultural values, practices of the Hawaiian people, and how to incorporate them in the planning process.

Jane Testa shared comments regarding the issue papers. At the Big Island meetings, the IssueBook was introduced to the audience in a PowerPoint presentation. Alex Frost, island coordinator for Hawai‘i island, developed the presentation which integrated the information from the issue papers with pictures and graphs. The IssueBook itself was also available for reference. Jane felt that the integration of the IssueBook in a colorful presentation was successful and very effective. There were many requests for electronic copies of the presentation. Jane suggested that Pamela Tumpap contact Alex regarding using the presentation in public awareness efforts. Janis Reischmann also agreed that the presentation was well done. However, due to the size of the file, electronic copies may be difficult to circulate. Janis will look into having it posted to the website.

Bill Kaneko attended the community meeting held at McKinley High School. The approximately 100 attendees had concerns about the military, but their recommendations for goals, strategies, and measurements were across the board. This group took particular interest in the IssueBook. They raised questions such as clarifying data and where the military fits in. Overall, Bill felt the meeting went well.

Janis Reischmann commented that there is a bias on the part of people attending these meetings. The people who are attending are those who *are* willing to attend community meetings and *are* involved in the community. Therefore, their responses would have a certain orientation to it. And because of this, she believes it is important to include the input of the population-based market research surveys that will be done shortly. She added that it is important to remember who goes to these meetings, how the data is presented, and is the data balanced. Janis commented on the “triple bottom line,” the balance between the economy, social well-being, and environment. From the community meeting perspective, this is a hard concept to understand—it is not what is driving their thinking. She believes the challenge for this task force will be how to get people to think about economy as it relates to environmental protection and social well-being.

Janis thanked all island coordinators for their efforts in informing people about the community meetings and getting them to attend. Janis also commented that she believes a Castle and Cooke representative attended every meeting. At the Kona meeting, one representative informed her that the company was sending a representative to every meeting to hear what the community perspectives were. Pamela Tumpap added that she has been contacted by one of their marketing personnel to give them her perspective on the meetings. Janis added to previous comments regarding the connection between state and county level plans by saying she believes it could be taken one level further with citizen engagement and citizen participation and follow-up. People are excited about this process and want to know how to continue working on it and how to be empowered to work on it. One challenge going forward will be how will we help seed that natural and healthy involvement that the communities would like to have.

The next step in this phase of community engagement will be to summarize the data collected from the community meetings and make summaries available for community review. Summaries and comments from the meetings will be posted to the website. Janis will work with Leland Chang in analyzing the data collected and identify common themes. The input on the definition, vision, and guiding principles of sustainability will be taken back to the Community Engagement Working Group; then forwarded to the Sustainability Definition Working Group for revisions if necessary. The input on goals, strategies, and measurements going forward will be used, in part, for the development of the telephone survey.

Representative Colleen Meyer wanted to get a sense on how well these meetings were attended and asked how many attended the Kailua and McKinley meetings. Janis estimated that there were about 50 people there but did not have a final count. Laura Thielen added that she counted about 36 people before the meeting but more people came in after it started. Janis and Bill responded that about 100 people attended the McKinley meeting. Senator Jill Tokuda also mentioned that she and Representative Pono Chong attended the Kailua meeting and noted that it was probably less attended because it was Earth Day and other activities were being held in the community. Janis added that all the meetings were held in the evenings from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. or on Saturday mornings.

Janis reviewed the report from the Community Engagement Working Group.

- Phase I Data Collection. A survey was used to solicit input on the definition, vision, and guiding principles of sustainability. The survey form was available in hard copy or online. Over 2,100 responses were received with the largest number of responses coming from the island of Maui. The information from the surveys was used to develop the draft definition, draft vision, and draft guiding principles.
- Phase II Community Meetings. With the completion of the second phase of community meetings, a second survey will be developed. SMS Research has been contracted to develop the survey and will be available online.

- Phase II Survey. Representative Pono Chong questioned that if the purpose for conducting a survey is to get the feel of the general population, isn't that statistically not good to just then offer it to anybody—shouldn't the random sample be statistically sound. Janis clarified by saying that there will be a scientific or random data set or sample that will be analyzed. At the same time information can be collected from individuals who may want to give their input, giving your both sets of data.

Brad Kurokawa commented since the Phase I survey showed biases, should certain groups be targeted to fill in the gaps. How do you ensure from the random sample that you get a representative population? Jim Dannemiller from SMS Research responded that its “magic,” explaining that you start off with a sampling frame of all the people in the State, mathematically draw a sample from there, then proceed to call those from the random sample. There may be some slight bias, but in the end you should have substantial numbers of all types of people. And, if there is something wrong, the statistics can always be weighted back.

James Spencer added that if the random sampling is taken from land line telephone records, there will still be gaps with people who have cellular phones and no land lines and the homeless. If you really want to get a random sampling of the general population, you would need to use the telephone survey as a core and also do a directed sampling or directed outreach to those outside the sampling frame.

Janis commented that the island coordinators are trying to target certain groups to outreach. Pamela Tumpap commented the Salvation Army on Maui could be a resource to outreach to the homeless population. Janis suggested that task force members give island coordinators a list of the general population that they would like to hear from. Janis added that the type of data collected so far are age data, geographic data, ethnic data, and perspectives that people self report. Those who responded to the first survey were generally older and from the neighbor islands than the general population.

David Goode commented that you will probably run into these problems in any survey and wanted to know how big were these gaps? Jim responded that at the end of November 2006, research showed that there is a very definite demographic bias in cellular phones and homelessness. David clarified by asking what was the percentage of these groups. Jim responded that the percentage of the population that is homeless is about 3 percent and the cellular phone only population is estimated at 9 to 11 percent.

Jeffrey Hunt commented that it is good to use statistical analysis to target the gap groups, but is a little uncomfortable if the over-represented groups get diluted because their voices are strong. Jim commented that he shares a slightly different viewpoint—the survey should be part of the process. The discussion seems to look at the survey as if it's the end product in and of itself. Another way to look

at the survey would be that there is information on a broadly-measured group of people, make this information part of the process, present the information back to the community and ask what they think of the information presented.

Representative Pono Chong asked what the purpose for doing a survey was. Janis responded that the survey would confirm community input on the definition, vision, and guiding principles of sustainability and set a course for goals and measures. Jane Testa added that the survey would seek input from members of the community that do not attend the meetings but would like to give their input. Representative Chong suggested dropping the section of the survey that anyone could fill out because if you're only looking for a statistical sampling, what is the purpose of it and how are you going to pay for it. People can go to the website to give their input without answering a survey. Janis explained that the survey would be used to seek input from the community on questions you seek answers to. The information received would then be easier understand and use in moving forward in the process. If community input is sought by having them send their thoughts to the website, we would end up with so much merited information to analyze. Bill further explained that the survey would retest the qualitative information because as mentioned earlier the information is bias. Janis understood Representative Chong's point to be why open up the survey to the general public to weigh in and instead go with the statistically significant sample. Representative Chong added that there are other ways to seek input, for example, the form on the website. Janis explained that the Phase II survey replaces the Phase I survey and that the purpose is to seek information to what we are looking for and use instead of receiving open ended comments.

James Spencer added that part of the process is engagement. He shared his experience when doing a similar process with Maui County. Input from about 700 residents was sought through two methods—focus groups and survey with statistical principles. The respondents' priorities for housing, economy, etc. were quite different, so the question asked was what should be done with the information. The data did not invalidate the results, but it was not very useful in terms of one validating the other because the people attending the meetings are the ones likely to respond to the problems of the general population and the general population has their own vision. It's an initial leadership vs. the testing of the general population—which is very distinct.

Jim Dannemiller commented that it helps to know where there are gaps and where we need to do more proactive education or try to move opinions because there are those two different perspectives.

Senator Jill Tokuda asked about the online responses and how many small group meetings have the island coordinators conducted—small group meetings would be an economical way for the task force to assess what groups are missing and should be targeted. Janis responded that, to date, there have been about 2,200 responses in total—about half online and the other half in hard copy. Island

coordinators tried to encourage small group meetings but had difficulty due to a couple of reasons: 1) time constraints—groups felt they didn't have enough time to organize meetings, and 2) groups didn't feel comfortable facilitating meetings on their own. The island coordinators instead went to existing group meetings and events and distributed hard copy surveys—senior citizen center activities, school classrooms, etc.

Senator Tokuda also asked, with regards to community engagement, at what point will the community be asked for their opinion on the next steps—when do we make this relevant and tangible and practical and get their assessment of how to move forward. Janis responded by stating that how to make it tangible and how to make it relevant to people are two different issues. At the recent community meetings, people were asked their opinions on goals, strategies, and measures for sustainability, which will take them into the next step. To make this tangible or real to people, we need to think hard on how to instill the sense of ownership that is there at the community level.

Jim Dannemiller discussed components of the telephone survey. The telephone survey will use random digit dialing with a sample size of 2,000; 500 per county. The survey instrument consists of several sections, each sections having about the same number of questions.

- economy
- environment
- social/cultural
- governance
- specific issues that stand across from the three general dimensions of the problem
- trade-offs, dealing primarily with economy and environment
- demographics; and
- “left behinds,” education, planning and monitoring, comfortable life

The survey has been put into Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) format and will be pre-tested tonight or tomorrow. Once the survey has been approved, telephone surveys could begin as early as next week. Analysis of the data collected will follow and a report prepared by mid June.

Representative Pono Chong asked how the data collected will be used with regards to the counties. Bill Kaneko responded that the data will be given to the counties to give them insight on what their constituents are saying. Representative Chong added that the data would not be used necessarily to lead the task force or indicate whether we are on the right track or not. Bill responded that it would be used, but the counties could also use it to better understand where their constituents are in terms of sustainability.

Jim Dannemiller asked Representative Chong what is the “right track.” He explained that he takes a slightly different viewpoint of the use of the survey. For example, if respondents were asked if we should have more or less pollution, and 60 percent is “yes” we should have more pollution and 40 percent said “less,” should we then work for more pollution? Representative Chong asked what the limitations of the survey are and how should it be used and not used. Jim responded that the survey will show that you can’t define the best future for 2050 because there isn’t one. The job of the task force is to make it happen. When the decision is made that the future will look like this, the survey will show you how the population differs from that, where the differences are, and make recommendations on what might be done by then—education, cooperate, convince, and/or change. Bill reiterated that the survey, like the community meetings and outreach, is not an end all deal. It is one receptacle of credible information that the task force needs to look at in identifying what the policy directives are going to be going forward.

Karl Kim asked if the survey was designed with the intent to establish some baseline metrics or a set of baseline conditions as to what people are willing to do, what they understand in terms of sustainability, and then would there be specific questions that would be re-asked again over time. Jim responded that there is a second survey planned and that he didn’t have a definitive answer to the question because this survey deals more with values and since strategies have yet to be determined, the questions on what are they willing to do or what they understand can not be asked.

James Spencer noted the importance of the question brought up earlier on what will be done with the survey. He commented that some direction is needed before getting into it. One of the big issues is that we’ve come to this intersection of leadership and followership. On one hand you’re asking for the public’s feeling on certain topics, but the public is not the ones constantly thinking of these thoughts, it’s the leadership. There is a need to identify groups that have a misunderstanding of the process. Keith Kurahashi asked if the sample size for O’ahu will give an accurate read on the general population. Jim responded that a sample size of 500 will put the survey in the area of about plus or minus 4.2 percent.

Representative Chong inquired if you would get only a county perspective and not a state perspective. Jim responded that you could get both a county and state perspective.

Laura Thielen commented that one criticism of the State Plan and Functional Plans was that it was not specific enough. Considering the timeline, will this survey or any other instrument being used from now until July, bring to the table information that will provide us with greater specificity than there is in the existing State and Functional Plans. Bill responded that the comments received from the recent community meetings should address specific goals. In addition,

the Accountability Work Group is going forward in designing and addressing the governance issues of where does 2050 fit within the overall planning process. Laura added that comments made at the Kailua meeting were very specific just like comments made during the original State Plan process, so will the survey identify trade-offs, sequencing, priorities, what should come first—something that will take us to the greater level of specificity. Bill responded that most of her concerns will be addressed by the Accountability Work Group.

Bill Kaneko briefly reported on the Hawai‘i Kids Voting. A consistent concern that is heard at these task force meetings is what youth think about sustainability. The Girls Scouts have been engaged to get youth involved. The Girl Scouts, together with the Department of Education, will coordinate a Youth Summit. Some of the questions to be used in Hawai‘i Kids Voting will be tested at the summit.

Bill also reported on the Hawai‘i 2050 Business Leadership Council breakfast meeting. About 30 business executives attended the first meeting. Two meetings were originally scheduled but the group requested to have more meetings. The next meeting is scheduled for May 25 at the Plaza Club from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. Many executives commented that their companies practice sustainability, but call it something else like cost-effectiveness, cost-cutting, etc. Many executives expressed their company’s desire to participate in this effort. For example, the Chamber of Commerce has agreed to be the receptacle for best practices for the business community. Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland asked if the breakfast meeting was for business executives only or were task force members invited to participate. Bill responded that the meetings are targeted for business executives, but task force members are welcomed to attend. Members can contact Bill or Jeanne Schultz if they are interested in attending the meetings.

Bill presented to the task force a proposal for the Hawai‘i 2050 Summit. Finding a venue for the summit was difficult with very limited opportunities to schedule for a weekday or weekend. To have maximum community participation, the summit would need to be held on a Saturday. Since 1,000 participants are projected to attend the summit, it is proposed that the summit be presentational based rather than participatory based. The program would be designed to inspire and motivate and also present the draft plan to the community. The proposed program would begin at 8:30 a.m. and conclude at 12:30 p.m. with a reception to follow. The proposed program would include an opening song by someone like Jack Johnson or other musical celebrity, messages from Hawai‘i’s youths, results from both surveys, presentation of the draft plan, and conclude with a keynote speaker such as Al Gore or other sustainability celebrity. The October/November outreach schedule for the 12 community meetings will be distributed at the conclusion of the summit. The general public will have an opportunity to comment on the draft plan at these community meetings. Much of the same logistics used at the Kick-off Event will be used at the Summit—simulcast, transportation, scholarships, etc. The Honolulu Advertiser is being approached to be a major sponsor of the summit.

Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland asked how much advance time would task force members have to review various drafts of the plan before it is discussed at the task force

meetings. Bill responded that he will work on a schedule that will pin point what steps need to be done at each meeting. Senator Chun Oakland requested if information needed could be distributed a week prior to the meetings for review.

Representative Pono Chong inquired what the plan would look like. Bill responded that the task force would ultimately decide what the plan would look like. Comments being expressed are that the plan should not be too long or elaborate and should have an appendix to support itself; should be written in a way that the general public can understand it; and should include measurements, but not too many. Senator Chun Oakland inquired when the information collected from the community meetings will be presented to the task force. Bill responded that the information should be presented in June.

Representative Ryan Yamane commented that the work of the Accountability Work Group seems very “legislative,” so how will the plan be useful to businesses, public sector, youth, etc. Bill responded saying that those issues will be covered at the third Accountability Work Group meeting and that Representative Yamane is welcomed to attend. Laura Thielen inquired if anyone could attend the meetings. Pamela Tumpap clarified that Chair Kokubun had stated at an earlier meeting that he could not expand the work group but interested parties could attend the meetings as audience members. Senator Chun Oakland informed the task force that there was an agenda item for the Accountability Work Group and concerns may be brought up at that time.

Bill asked if there were any other concerns with the proposed summit—date, venue, and approach. Representative Chong inquired if private sponsorships are being sought. Bill responded that private sponsorship is needed. Pamela suggested developing guidelines for sponsorships—sponsors should be informed of what they would get from sponsoring task force activities. Keith Kurahashi suggested soliciting sponsorships from those who are taking active roles in sustainability and have similar goals as the task force. Task force members voiced concerns regarding public perception of sponsors. Pamela commented that if sponsors expected recognition for sponsorship, the task force would need to consider the ramifications of such recognition. Laura suggested that speakers at the Hawai‘i 2050 Summit who speak on behalf of the task force should not be a sponsor. Bill will draft some guidelines for sponsorships and present it to the task force.

Jeffrey Hunt inquired if the task force would receive a copy draft plan prior to the summit. Bill responded that the task force will receive a copy prior to the summit and also noted that there will be many policy decisions to make from now until the draft plan is presented for review. Senator Jill Tokuda asked if the counties were approached or considered as sponsors. Beth Tokioka responded that it was too late since the counties have already submitted their budgets to their respective councils.

Karl Kim commented that when drafting the plan, the task force should consider specific actions to recommend for individuals, families, neighborhoods, communities, businesses, state and county governments, etc. The public has a desire to know where the plan will take them and what the plan really means. Bill suggested drafting the plan in terms of

three levels—government action, private sector action, and individual action. How do these levels inter-relate and how do you create measurements so that it will work bottom up and top down.

Representative Yamane commented that it seems like the end result of the process is a piece of legislation. He has concerns that the public will be disappointed, after all these months of input, to be presented with legislation and no user-friendly plan for action. Bill responded that the legislation will be one component of the plan.

- IV. Report from the Public Awareness Work Group.** Patrick Williams reported on public awareness activities taken place since the last task force meeting. A summary of public awareness activities was distributed to members. Press releases were distributed to daily and weekly newspapers and radio stations on each island informing the public of the 12 community meetings. A thirty second radio script has been drafted for airtime on the neighbor islands. The schedule for the community meetings; comments received on the definition, vision, and guiding principles; and the IssueBook and summary have been posted to the website. The website is in the process of becoming more interactive. In March, the number of “hits” on the website doubled. The contact database has been cleaned-up and the first e-newsletter was sent out about 10 days ago. A logo has been created and will be used wherever possible.

Jane Testa mentioned that on Hawai‘i Island there has been several front-page articles about Hawai‘i 2050 in the *Hawai‘i Tribune Herald*, *West Hawai‘i Today*, and the *Hawai‘i Island Journal*. This morning, someone at the airport passed along a copy of the *Big Island Weekly* which promoted the Hawai‘i Island community meetings. Patrick Williams added that it is important to continue contact with the media and keeping them informed of various task force activities.

Beth Tokioka commented that if the individuals on the database list requested to be on the list, then others, such as county council members and other county personnel, should be encouraged to be added to the list. Beth suggested that neighbor island task force members send Patrick a list of individuals they see as important stakeholders in the sustainability process. Pamela Tumpap also suggested that members forward to Patrick articles relating to Hawai‘i 2050 or sustainability that is distributed within their organization to help promote sustainability efforts. Patrick added that they will approach the private sector to ask them if they could use their communication devices to promote the efforts of the task force.

James Spencer commented on the issue of public awareness and the proposed legislative and other strategies by saying that he is unsure of what is being promoted—we can generate awareness of Hawai‘i 2050, but are we generating expectations that there will be specific legislations and projects associated with 2050 or promoting ideas of how individual choices, based on individual or corporate choice, could change behavior. If legislation is created, where in the process are we doing the economic analysis for budgeting and triage of investments and tax credits of certain directions to encourage individual or corporate behavior. Pamela Tumpap responded that much of what James is

asking will be discussed in Accountability Work Group. Most of what is being promoted now is the process and community engagement. James continued by asking if there was enough time, by the September deadline, to draft specific proposals that are strong on economical analysis, especially since they would have to be financed in some way. Bill responded that the plan would be drafted on the process rather than the content—how to be engaged and participate in the plan itself. James further commented that when the plan is presented to the public, will the plan have proposed action items or be a description of the community engagement process. The process is important in and of itself but it presumes that the change that the process drives is that people don't know how to live sustainably, once they know how, they will make the choice to live sustainably. On the other hand, it would be completely different, for example, if the plan were to give tax credits for triple bottom line business or developments that have cultural characters to it, there may not be sufficient time to do the economic analysis for financing these types of interventions. Pamela acknowledged James' concerns noting the need to be careful of what the messages are when the task force goes out to promote them.

Representative Colleen Meyer had concerns that the Champions list speaks of the “triple bottom line” and introducing the project to the audience, which seems like you're talking about specifics, but prior discussions seem to focus on the process. If you want people to “buy-in,” there needs to be more specifics. Bill noted that the specifics will be in the plan itself. Representative Meyer inquired what the purpose of the Champions list was. Bill responded that the list is a mechanism for the task force to reach out to key constituency groups. If the plan is to work, it needs to be reviewed by labor, churches, ethnic groups, business, non-profits, etc. The list will aide in identifying who the leaders are and to reach out and engage them.

Laura Thielen voiced some concerns that, up until this point, 90 percent of the discussions have been on the process; and if the plan is to be presented in September, it would be difficult to invite people to participate in the process and not discuss the plan's content. She continued saying that work needs to focus on the content so that we are able to present a draft plan that outlines specific actions.

Representative Ryan Yamane had concerns with the semantic use of the word “Champions.” When you speak of project champions, you are talking about a person or company or entity that takes the lead in the efforts, but the list seems to refer more to sponsors. He would consider the community, counties, or native Hawaiian groups as “champions.” Representative Yamane also agreed with previous comments of having a plan that outlines specific actions to be taken. The community expects a plan that will change people's behavior towards a sustainable future and he believes that legislation will not change their behavior.

Beth Tokioka is confident that, even with the time constraints, if you trust the process, the goals of this task force can be achieved. Beth also added that the Community Engagement Working Group did a good job synthesizing the data collected on the definition, vision, and guiding principles and presenting it to the task force in a timely manner. Bill commented that when the definition, vision, and guiding principles were

presented at the 12 recent community meetings, the communities had little feedback. He believes this was due to the fact that what was presented to the community captured the spirit of what they had said when first asked to comment on the definition, vision, and guiding principles.

Pamela Tumpap applauded HIPA for posting information on the H2050 website very quickly and providing feedback mechanisms online for the community to voice their concerns. Pamela also added that communication between the task force and the community is ongoing through the website, even when not participating in specific community engagement activities.

Shanna Trevana, a member of the audience, commented that she would like to see a plan that has many well-defined projects with tangible goals and milestones that creates a realistic roadmap and place where the community could go to participate in these projects. Anyone wishing to participate would be given a packet that would guide them to the next step. Examples of projects could be curb-side recycling or a 10-hour sustainability curriculum for grades K through 12. Bill Kaneko added that Kem Lowry expressed those same ideas—the community wants action. James Spencer commented that an inventory of viable sustainability projects currently in process needs to be taken, for example, recycling and mass transit (on O‘ahu).

Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland commented that discussions seem to indicate that there is an interest in expanding participation in the Accountability Work Group. Bill first addressed James’ comments by saying that at the recent community meetings, the community gave their input on goals and strategies and they came up with about 200 of them. The task force would then need to prioritize which are the top 25. Bill commented that the accountability issue is a little complex. An understanding of the complexities of the inter-relationships between the levels of government and how it impacts the private sector and individual actions is needed. Senator Chun Oakland clarified her comment saying that there seems to be interest by task force members to be part of the work group and added that she was unsure of how many members were on the Accountability Work Group but it seemed to be a small number. Jeanne Schultz and Pamela responded that the work group includes 12 individuals from the task force and the community. Bill added that proposals from the Accountability Work Group will be presented to the task force for final approval. He also commented that the Accountability Work Group has a difficult task at hand due to the sensitivity of issues. The work group is looking at the different themes that have come out of the community meetings and determining who would be responsible for coordinating the plan in terms of individual action at the state, county, etc. level. Once the ideal themes or characteristics of a 2050 plan are identified, then accountability can be addressed.

- V. Update on the Accountability Work Group.** Bill reported that there were eight key issues that the work group needed to address (distributed at a prior task force meeting). The first two dealt with how H2050 fits into current state and county planning schemes and how it would fit within the State’s existing planning process, in particular, the State Plan and Functional Plans. There was no definite answer to these issues, but the work

group agreed that the 2050 plan should not be forced upon the counties and the need for coordination on this effort. The group acknowledged the work put into the State Plan and Functional Plans and should be respectful of the existing plans. Other key issues were how H2050 engages with the private sector and individuals and who will measure and how they will measure the progress of the plan. Bill will email task force members the series of eight key issues to be addressed by the work group. Work group members are forwarding their comments on the issues to Bill. Issues such as should the plan be incentive based or a voluntary program or will there be enforcement mechanism are some concerns heard from the work group. Should there be a balance of enforcement and incentive-based mechanisms in the design of the plan.

Pamela Tumpap added that the work group recognized the importance of integration among all levels and will look towards task force members who are from the county level to assist in informing them on how their suggestions would impact the county. Laura Thielen commented that the work group should also look at the relationships within state agencies and within county agencies. Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland suggested that, in reference to earlier comments on individuals on the H2050 database, the heads of the various levels of state and county governments should be included in the database.

Representative Pono Chong referred to the summary points for the second Accountability Work Group meeting of April 17, 2007, and asked for clarification on the fourth bulleted point stating that there may be a role for the judicial branch vis-a-vis constitutional amendment. Bill Kaneko responded that the comment meant that if the concept of sustainability was imbedded into the constitution, the courts would have to uphold that in their decision-making.

Representative Ryan Yamane inquired if the county councils will be asked to introduce legislation on sustainability issues that relate to the counties or if county administrators should adopt rulemaking policies relating to sustainable practices. Ian Costa believes that the county councils and county administrations would need to introduce legislation or adopt rules relating to sustainability issues in order for the plan to move forward. Representative Yamane concurred with Ian but noted that it was not listed as one of the bulleted points. Bill clarified that the summary points were discussion items raised at the meeting—brainstorming comments.

Representative Chong inquired how members of the work group were chosen. Pamela responded that the members were chosen by the Chair Kokubun. Ian expressed his interest in participating in the Accountability Work Group. Chair Kokubun will be informed of Ian's interest to participate in the work group. Representative Yamane asked if anyone associated with fiscal impact, for example, Senate Ways and Means and House Finance Committees, is on the work group. Jeanne Schultz responded that there was not and that the Chair was trying to balance individuals from both the public and private sectors in the work group. Jeanne also added that in accordance with Sunshine Laws, the work group can only consist of 12 members. The Accountability Work Group includes four task force members, two legislators, and six members from non-profit or private sectors. Representative Yamane restated his concerns for the inclusion of individuals

from the fiscal committees especially since the final plan will be reported to the Legislature. Senator Chun Oakland would like to suggested to the Chair that if the work group could not be expanded to include planning directors and fiscal staff, then could they be called upon for their expert advice. Bill reminded members that they will have to approve the draft plan before it is presented to the community as well as the final plan before it is submitted to the Legislature.

- VI. Update and Discussion of Other Sustainability Activities.** Bill briefly reported on various sustainability activities taking place. Hawai‘i Business and HIPA will be sponsoring their third forum of the Hawai‘i Business 2050 Series on Sustainability. The forum will be held on May 12 from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. at the Hawai‘i Prince Hotel and will focus on energy as it relates to bio-fuels.

House Bill No. 1270 appropriated \$850,000 to continue the efforts of the task force.

Shawna Trevana reported on the success of Sustainable Saunders, an event that took place in Saunders Hall on April 20, 2007 (Earth Day) from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. and concluded with a concert. To promote sustainability, flyers were printed on recycled paper, plates and cups were bio-degradable, decorations were hand-made by painting discarded cardboard, and bamboo and organic cotton T-shirts were sold. Shawna also added that their group fundraised all the moneys used to produce the event themselves and no money was used for advertising—the group used their own energy to promote the event. Food vendors given \$250 to serve 1,000 bite-sized samples dishes made from local and organic products. Approximately 1,000 people attended the event. There were 15 different themed areas with experts in each area. People were allowed to roam from area to area. Many partnerships were created from the event.

- VII. Report on Stakeholder Outreach.** Bill reported on various stakeholder outreach activities. On May 10, a breakfast meeting, sponsored by Pacific Resource Partnership, was held with about 25 developers in attendance. Colonel Howard Killien of Schofield Barracks made a presentation to the group.

Brad Kurokawa announced that plans are being developed for sessions with the Hawai‘i Congress of Planning Officials on September 26-28, 2007 at Haupuna Prince Hotel. The theme will be a mixed plate of sustainability.

A meeting is being scheduled with Punahou School on May 17th to discuss the school’s sustainability efforts. Chair Kokubun would also like to meet with other private and public schools.

- VIII. Next Steps; Plan for Future Meetings.** Jeanne Schultz informed the task force that due to scheduling conflicts, Chair Kokubun will inform them of the next meeting via email.

- IX. Adjourn.** Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland thanked everyone in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 4:03 p.m.