

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

Members Present: Senator Russell Kokubun, Representative Pono Chong, Senator Mike Gabbard, David Goode, Marion Higa, Jeffrey Hunt, Keith Kurahashi, Brad Kurokawa, Senator Ron Menor, Representative Colleen Meyer, Keith Rollman, Jane Testa, Stacie Thorlakson, Beth Tokioka, Senator Jill Tokuda, Pamela Tumpap, Representative Ryan Yamane

Members Not Present: Representative Lyla Berg, Ian Costa, Henry Eng, Karl Kim, Millie Kim, James Spencer, Michael Tresler

I. Call to Order. A quorum was established and Chair Russell Kokubun called the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force meeting to order at 1:21 p.m. on Thursday, September 13, 2007, at the Hawai'i State Capitol in Room 414. Introduction of task force members.

II. Review and Approve of Minutes. The minutes from the July 25, 2007 task force meeting was distributed to members. Chair Russell Kokubun entertained a motion to approve the minutes. David Goode moved to approve the minutes; Senator Mike Gabbard seconded the motion. Chair Kokubun opened discussion on the minutes. The task force unanimously approved the July 25, 2007 minutes.

Chair Kokubun acknowledged two written testimonies submitted to the task force. Lisa Gibson representing the Hawaii Science & Technology Council and Hawaii Science & Technology Institute summarized their testimony presented to the task force. The existence of the Council and the Hawaii Science & Technology Institute is to accelerate the growth of existing and emerging science and technology sectors. One of the challenges the science and technology industry faces is collecting data from the range of nine sectors. The information needs to be aggregated across the sectors and acknowledged the work of Enterprise Honolulu for bringing together the separate sectors and presenting the data included in the written testimony. About 5 percent of the workforce is employed in pure-tech jobs and 10 percent employed in what is referred to as imbedded or enabled technology jobs. The kinds of technology jobs in Hawai'i brings solutions to environment, health care, and other issues that are important to the people here. The Council requests that the task force consider their recommended amendments to the draft plan.

Jeff Au, Managing Director for the PacifiCap Group presented testimony to the task force. PacifiCap Group is Hawai'i's largest locally based venture capital firms. Jeff highlighted two concerns with the draft plan. First, the conclusion, whether implicit or

explicit, that the technology sector is not that significant in Hawai‘i today or in the long term for sustainability. Jeff also commented on something he found interesting in the IssueBook. In one section it was stated that 2 percent of the workforce is in technology and in the previous section it was stated that 50 years ago 2 percent of the income was attributable to the tourist sector. He believes that we need the same vision as our grandparents—technology may be 2 percent today, but tourism was only 2 percent 50 years ago. His second concern was with the tax incentives of Act 221 and the Tax Review Commission’s report. The report’s executive summary is very critical of the tax incentives of Act 221, indicating that it is a “black hole” and results cannot be determined. However, tables in the same report indicate positive data from the Department of Taxation. He urged members to read the entire report and not only the executive summary.

Margaret Wiley, a resident from the Big Island, presented oral comments to the task force. She shared her concerns with the composition of the Sustainability Council. She would like the task force to consider that the composition be of community members who participate in all interest groups and not just a balance of special interest groups. She also supports the creation of an executive branch department for sustainability.

Chair Kokubun asked task force members that if there are no objections, he would like to discuss some of the agenda items out of order. There were no objections from the task force. Chair Kokubun moved to discussion on agenda item 4, Report on Other Activities.

III. Discussion and Approval of the Hawai‘i 2050 Draft Plan. A copy of the draft plan was distributed to task force members. Bill Kaneko informed the task force that the draft plan is only a start. The final plan will include graphs, photos, charts, etc. and will be visually more attractive. The draft not only presents the draft but it also tells the story about sustainability. Jeffrey Hunt supports the idea that the plan be formatted like a story, which is more readable and user friendly.

Chair opened discussion on the Hawai‘i 2050 draft plan.

Cover Page through List of Task Force Members (pages 1-11):

David Goode suggested having the definition of sustainability on the front cover. Pamela Tumpap also suggested incorporating the use of quotes to “draw in” the reader’s attention, similar to quotes used on the webpage. Representative Pono Chong commented that data is also needed in the plan. He also cautioned on who is being quoted and public perception of that person.

I. Background and Origins of Hawai‘i 2050 (pages 12-15):

Pamela suggested including in the background of the Hawai‘i State Plan the fact that there was a statewide effort in developing the State Plan. Also, in early discussions by the Accountability Work Group, there was agreement that the work put into the State Plan would be honored and be the foundation in developing the Hawai‘i 2050 Plan, but

she did not see it in the Origins of Hawai‘i 2050 section. In the section, Using the Hawai‘i 2050 Plan, Beth Tokioka suggested that acknowledgement that individuals played a role in the plan should be included. Pamela also did not see any tie to local planning initiatives and acknowledging those planning efforts in the communities. Keith Rollman suggested adding Pamela’s comments to the last paragraph in the appendix where it discusses county general and development plans. Chair Kokubun also commented that Pamela’s concerns are addressed in a later section, Hawai‘i 2050 and Other Governmental Planning Efforts.

II. Why Hawai‘i 2050? (pages 16-17):

Bill Kaneko acknowledged Paul “Doc” Berry for authoring this section of the draft plan.

III. What’s Different About Hawai‘i 2050 (pages 18-19):

Senator Jill Tokuda questioned whether, other than wordsmithing, would this be the last opportunity that the task force could make recommendations on the draft plan before the summit. Chair Kokubun clarified that this would be the last opportunity to comment on the draft plan before it is unveiled at the summit and welcomed any comments from the task force other than wordsmithing. Typographical comments should be passed on to Bill. Senator Tokuda had concerns with keeping positive terminology throughout the draft plan. For example, the draft uses “operate better schools and have better jobs” and this could be interpreted as our schools are not good. We should lift people up and not say that they are not good enough. Keith Kurahashi commented that references to community involvement seemed quite prevalent throughout the draft plan and may be eliminated in some areas. Jeffrey Hunt commented that the plan should be sensitive to the spelling and use of the okina in Hawaiian words.

IV. Hawai‘i 2050 and Other Government Planning Efforts (page 20):

Since this section addresses county planning issues, Chair Kokubun requested that the county planners on the task force review this section carefully and feel comfortable with the language. Kirsten Baumgard Turner, a member of the audience, suggested including how the county government and other industry focus plans will integrate with the sustainability plan. Representative Ryan Yamane inquired if the plan will be presented to the county councils and county administrations for support. Bill responded that a letter supporting the 2050 planning process and signed by all four mayors will be presented at the Summit. Representative Yamane clarified if they would support the process or the plan. Bill responded they are supporting the process. Beth Tokioka commented that it wouldn’t be fair to ask the mayors to support the plan without seeing the final plan. Representative Yamane requested seeking the support of the mayors when the plan is finalized. Jeffrey cautioned that if the plan is presented to the county councils for support, you run the risk that they may not support it or may want to micro-edit the plan. He is unsure if the reward is worth the risk. Representative Yamane added that if you do not seek support, you run the similar risk of being criticized of not seeking their input. Beth suggested that during the public comment period, county council members should

be encouraged to participate in the community meetings and voice their suggestions and comments. Pamela re-emphasized the need to present a vision to the councils and mayors on how the plan will be integrated with county plans. Senator Tokuda suggested that during the community engagement period, meetings with county council members, administrations, and cabinet representatives should be scheduled to have a personal discussion on the plan. Keith Rollman commented that if we did our job correctly, we created a vision with the community's consensus which would be hard for anyone not to support. The plan should be taken to decision makers that we have no jurisdiction over and "sell" it to them so that they can incorporate it in their planning process. Chair Kokubun commented that it is important to note that we are not trying to impose the State's will on the counties, especially on jurisdictional issues and we need to clearly state that the plan will not take away any powers from the counties. Pamela agreed and commented that it should be reflected in this section. Senator Ron Menor commented that continually through the planning process, county representative task force members should update and encourage participation by the county councils, administration, and cabinet representatives. Chair Kokubun commented that early in the planning process, the task force did meet with the counties to inform them on the task force's efforts. Jeffrey again voice concerns that it would be great if we get county "buy-ins" but fears the plan may be returned with many amendments. Beth commented some concerns can be addressed during the public comment period. Representative Yamane suggested creating partnerships with the counties in the drafting stage. Senator Menor commented that the focus seems to be mainly on integrating county plans, but there should also be emphasis on integration with state agencies. What efforts are being made in coordinating with state administration? Other task force members also shared concerns with the acceptance of the plan at the state and county levels. Chair Kokubun commented that the tone of this section should be to respect jurisdictional authority. Bill commented that they will work on this section further.

V. Another Plan on the Shelf? A Test of Political and Community Will (page 21):

David Goode and Representative Yamane voiced concerns with the examples "little things" mentioned in the fifth paragraph. These are examples of energy and environment, but what about cultural and agricultural examples. Pamela suggested using examples that reflect the triple bottom line. Chair Kokubun suggested seeking input from Kanu Hawai'i for examples. Representative Yamane also suggested including the support of local artists in music. Senator Tokuda commented that the "little things" should be diverse and not only environmentally friendly things. This plan is not only about being "green" but a vision of Hawai'i. Shanna Trevanna, a member from the audience, suggested having a more positive tone to this section and to provide examples of benefits to making various choices.

VI. The Planning Approach to Hawai'i 2050 (pages 22-24):

Beth commented that in her first read through of the plan, the *ahupua'a* concept is not mentioned until around page 50 and believes it should be mention sooner and this may be a good section to mention it. Bill agreed and suggested having it mentioned even further

in the beginning of this draft. Beth also commented that the *ahupua'a* concept was discussed at many of the community engagement meetings. Chair Kokubun clarified that this section reflects the community engagement report. Representative Chong expressed concerns on the use of the word *ahupua'a*. It should be used because it is something that we want to do and not just because it's a nice word or the "buzz" word of the day. Keith Kurahashi commented that he believes that the concept of an *ahupua'a* system was a model of sustainability. Pamela suggested using "model" as a qualifier is good. Chair Kokubun clarified that this section will be updated and include results from the second opinion poll. Bill added that a lot more information will be added to this section, for example, second community engagement report, KIDS Voting, web survey, public opinion poll, stakeholder meetings, etc. Lisa Gibson, a member of the audience commented that there are new data coming forward and suggested including it in the plan. She also mentioned that some of the data in the IssueBook was inaccurate. Chair Kokubun suggested that she contact Bill or Jeanne Schultz Afuvai regarding this.

VII. Community Engagement Results: Voice of the People, Stakeholders and Experts (pages 25-34):

Representative Yamane suggested deleting "public" in the second bullet on page 27 to read; "Improving education." since there are also private schools. Bill responded that he believes that at the community engagement meetings the concerns were targeted at public education and public schools. Representative Yamane commented that he thought public education and youth referred to all youth and not only those who went to public schools. Keith Kurahashi commented that public perception could be that private school students do better on testing and have an advantage to better education. Chair Kokubun suggested that Representative Yamane's concerns could be addressed in the Community and Social Well Being section of the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Plan and this section should reflect the concerns of the community engagement meetings. Pamela suggested providing a definition of origins of the term Kanaka Maoli. Keith Rollman responded that it was footnoted previously on page 16. Bill added that they did seek advice from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and Hawaiian Civic Clubs on the definition of Kanaka Maoli. However, the definition was unclear and they will go back to OHA and the civic clubs to get a clearer and broader definition. Chair Kokubun commented that the sections on stakeholder outreach and survey results will be expanded and suggested added participant quotes to the last section on community dialogue.

VIII. Fact- and Research-Based Approach to Sustainability: The Hawai'i 2050 Issues Book (pages 35-36):

Pamela suggested acknowledging that the data presented was data that was available at the time the plan was drafted. Representative Chong commented on addressing the issue of energy conservation and finding alternative energy. Bill responded that those issues are addressed later in the goals and strategies. Chair Kokubun suggested that if it is included in the IssueBook in the energy section then include it there. Pamela commented that it is important to acknowledge here that education was not overlooked because it was not a separate issue paper but imbedded throughout all issue papers in the IssueBook.

Jeanne pointed out that education was addressed in the second bullet on page 36. Jane Testa agreed with Pamela and commented that an acknowledgement in the introduction of this section may eliminate the readers concerns as to why education was not a separate issue. Lisa Gibson commented that workforce development is a huge issue and seems to be missing from this section. Chair Kokubun and Keith Kurahashi commented that workforce development is addressed in the IssueBook under Sustainable Economy but was not a separate topic. Chair Kokubun commented that the IssueBook should be an appendix to the plan.

IX. Hawai'i's Definition, Vision and Guiding Principles of Sustainability (pages 37-39):

Chair Kokubun clarified that page 37 was an introduction to the definition, vision, and guiding principles of sustainability. Pamela suggested adding reference to sustainable culture in the introduction paragraph. Chair Kokubun responded that it was reflected in the definition on the top of page 38. Jane inquired if this introductory section would be the appropriate place to mention the *ahupua'a* concept or model. Chair Kokubun recommended including a sentence in the introductory paragraph addressing the importance of island culture and *ahupua'a*. Keith Kurahashi suggested that Sections IX and X should be part of Section XI. The definition, vision, guiding principles, goals, strategic actions, and indicators are all part of the sustainability plan. Leland Chang commented that the third paragraph on page 37 notes that “Hundreds of public meetings were held statewide” and he is unsure of which meetings are being referenced here, but at the conclusion of the second round of community engagement meetings, a total of 42 meetings would have been held. If *all* “meetings” are being referenced here, there were probably hundreds of meetings held. Senator Tokuda commented that if the intent is to show how many people were involving in the process, you could reword it to say, “Thousands of individuals participated in public meetings held statewide,” to reflect those who participated in task force meetings, public meetings, both summits, etc. Kirsten Baumgard Turner suggested including in the introduction that this is a living document and will be updated to current times. Margaret Wiley commented that it is not until page 37 when you get to the heart of the document and suggests moving pages 5-36 to the back of the document. Some people may want to get to the “meat” of the document then read about the history of the plan later. Chair Kokubun commented that the issue of the substance and the process was discussed a lot and the task force felt the process was very important. It is important to understand how we got to the substance—it was not 25 members brainstorming on how to come up with a sustainable Hawai'i but the efforts of thousands of individuals who gave their input and expressed their concerns to the task force. Chair Kokubun recommended including an executive summary for those who may want to start at the heart of the document. Pamela agreed and suggested having Chair Kokubun's comments up front and noting that for those who wanted to skip the introductions could go directly to page “x.” Pamela also suggested using different color pages or dividers to identify the sections. Bill commented that they have enlisted the advice of Tom Coffman to assist in the “creative” or visual aspect of the plan. Stacie Thorlakson suggested that the website should also direct readers to preferred sections of the document.

X. Sustainability Goals, Strategic Actions and Indicators (pages 40-41):

Bill noted that he will clarify with Tom Coffman on the meaning of the last sentence on page 41. Brad Kurokawa commented that he interpreted the sentence to mean that the actions and strategies should ideally move simultaneously. Brad requested if Goal IV on page 40 could be written more positive tone. Keith Kurahashi suggested the following, “Encourage actions that will move communities towards a sustainable quality of life.” Pamela suggested explaining what is meant by the triple bottom line. Chair Kokubun suggested addressing Pamela’s concerns in Section IX on page 37.

XI. The Hawai‘i 2050 Sustainability Plan (pages 42-61):*A Way of Life*

Representative Yamane suggested rewriting the third sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 43 to be more positive—“Not everyone understands” may imply something negative. Bill commented that this section can be embellished in terms of adding graphics, background information, etc. Representative Yamane suggested using posters created by Hawai‘i’s youth in the State’s tobacco campaign. Chair Kokubun commented on the use of “why” throughout the section. Senator Tokuda commented that when the “whys” are close together it seems repetitive. Task force members discussed revising the heading for the right column of the indicator table to “Purpose.” Senator Menor suggested including positive trend statistics that tie-in directly with key sustainability issues, such as bottle deposit recycling or the use solar water heating systems. Pamela agreed but commented that using the cigarette statistic in this goal tied in with a way of life and recycling and alternative energy statistics could be used in the energy and environmental goals. Stacie suggested having the indicator tables placed on one page and if two pages are needed, continue the headings on the next page.

Representative Chong expressed concerns on two of the indicators on page 45—percentage use of solar or other alternative water heating sources and percentage of new cars purchased that use renewable fuel technology. It appears that we are endorsing a particular alternative energy source or fuel technology when there are others available. Representative Yamane commented that part of the 2050 vision is to look beyond what we have now, not only what can be predicted. Representative Chong added that the plan should also guide us along the way and not set for something that is so far ahead. Representative Chong further added that he is not against renewable fuel, but we should be looking at it in terms of conservation and encourage driving fuel-efficient cars. Beth commented that some of the indicators were developed because they were measurable. The indicators are not the goals in and of themselves and will change over time. Pamela agreed that the plan will be reviewed continually over time and the indicators and measurements will change and new ones will be added. Representative Chong commented that the indicator should not specify a particular industry but encompass all renewable energy sources. Chair Kokubun clarified that the indicators were differentiating between the various renewable energy sources for generating electricity and/or vehicular use as opposed to water heating. Representative Chong commented that if the other members agreed to these indicators, he is okay with that. Keith Kurahashi

commented that these indicators were probably chosen because they are measurable and the plan will be reviewed periodically and the indicators could change. Keith Rollman agreed that these metrics can be changed and added that the city is looking into carbon footprint metrics which many other cities are using so there is a way to evaluate and measure their progress against each other. Senator Tokuda shared Representative Chong's concerns and inquired if there was a way to amend the indicators differently so that is broader and not so specific. When you have indicators that are so specific, like solar water heating systems, especially after it follows an indicator measuring use of renewable and alternative energy, one would question why it has its own indicator when it could fall under the previous indicator. Pamela commented that she would not have a problem with including solar water heating systems under renewable and alternative energy as long as solar water heating systems is a measuring tool for that indicator because it is measurable and understood by consumers. Task force members suggested including solar water heating systems, photovoltaic systems, and possibly renewable fuel technology in the renewable and alternative energy indicator. Chair Kokubun commented that he believes that what differentiates the two indicators is that one measures energy generation and the other water heating. Representative Chong had concerns with the standards being changed every five years. The indicators should be broad enough to take through the whole course. Bill commented that they were trying to find a balance between having indicators that measure a sustainable community and also indicators that the general public could relate to. The intent is to create indicators that not only policymakers understand but also the general public. Senator Menor added that having solar water heating systems measured is something the general public can relate to and also supported by environmentalists. In fact, legislation has been introduced to encourage developers to install solar water heating systems in new residential construction to reduce the use of imported fossil fuels. Brad added to Bill's comments that these indicators are designed to measure living sustainably at a variety of ranges, from the individual, institutional, governmental, etc. and its good to include easy to measure indicators that will show how we are doing at the individual, governmental, and institutional levels. We can go on and debate each one of these indicators as to whether they are good or bad, broad or specific, etc. and that is not the point for this discussion. Chair Kokubun appreciated Brad's comments and added that with the task force's timeframe, asked members that unless they had major concerns with the goals, strategic actions, and indicators, he would like to allow the draft to move forward and make revisions during the community input period. Kirsten Baumgard Turner commented that she didn't see any pollution prevention indicators. Chair Kokubun responded that her concerns can be addressed in the environment section. He also noted that further discussion will be limited so that the entire draft can be reviewed and adopted before the conclusion of this task force meeting. Margaret Wiley suggested that the indicators be discussed in detail during the public comment period and note that these are sample indicators.

The Economy

Chair Kokubun commented that the narrative on workforce development and technology will be embellished further with new data as previously mentioned by Lisa Gibson. Chair Kokubun also shared that in his discussions with Bill, the business community,

although having extensive input in the draft, is a bit timid on fully endorsing this section of the draft.

Keith Kurahashi inquired what the purpose of the indicator measuring the income of top quintile relative to bottom quintile. Bill responded that the indicator would show a wide distribution of wealth. Task force members inquired on the definition of “quintile.” Keith Kurahashi responded that it meant top one-fifth and bottom one-fifth (income). Senator Tokuda suggested using terminology that the community would understand. Representative Chong reiterated his previous concerns with specifying science- and technology-based workers and post-secondary science and engineering students and why that industry should be measured and not other industries like film making or farmers. There should not be a focus on just one industry or imply that it is above other industries. Chair Kokubun commented that the intent was not to imply that this industry is more important than other and that should be clarified. Representative Chong added that in any plan, what gets measured, get done; especially if public report cards are issued, and that puts the industry above all others, whether intentional or not. Bill commented that the attempt was to address the issue the workforce’s role in a diversified economy; and science and technology was used as an example. Representative Chong commented that there are a host of other niche segments of our economy that we want to see succeed and not just one. Senator Tokuda asked if there are any other indicators that could show a diversified economy—part of the reason also is that most of us will not be here in the year 2050. We don’t know what diversified economy will mean 10, 20, 30 years from now and it may not be technology. Technology may boom now but in 30 years it may be old economy and there might be other industries, jobs that haven’t been created yet. If science and technology is specified, then you may have other industries reading the plan saying “what about me?” It may be impossible to find an indicator that is a little broader and would measure that we are doing a good job 10 years from now. Representative Chong commented that we need to come up with an indicator that will help lead people to where we want them to go. If that’s where you want people to go, that’s what should be measured and if you measure it, that’s where people go. Bill commented that he understands the policy implications to this, but by the same point in time, he can take every indicator, for example, dollar value and number of acres in agricultural production and say why agriculture and not fisheries. The task force needs to understand that at a certain point in time, you need to be specific—if you’re not specific, you will end up with a very bland report card. Representative Chong commented that it was specified that we wanted more food sustainability and that is why agriculture is measured. No one wanted more science and technology. Chair Kokubun asked for examples of elements of the economy that we would like diversified. Representative Chong responded, diversified agriculture. Chair Kokubun commented that diversified agriculture is already covered. Representative Chong commented that he is unsure because it would also depend on the marketplace. Keith Rollman commented that engineering and science was selected because when you look at world standards and measurements, they are tracked with economic growth and an expected standard. There is a growing consensus of the need for diversification tending towards the knowledge industry and there is a growth in knowledge industries. Even for agriculture, it has become a very scientific, technical endeavor. David commented that when speaking of diversification of various industries,

DBEDT measures our four industries on how large they are to each other, and his understanding of a diversified economy is not to have all of our eggs in one basket. He suggested having measurements that say no more than two industry groups shall encompass more than 50 percent of our economy, no more than four shall encompass more than 80 percent of our economy. Chair Kokubun commented that he believes that is addressed in the first indicator. Keith Kurahashi commented that if science and technology was an issue voiced at the community engagement meetings, it should be included as an indicator. Representative Chong disagreed by saying that the task force should not be choosing a specific industry, but if that's the consensus of the task force, so be it. Chair Kokubun asked then, how to you measure workforce development for a diversified economy and does it need to be measured. Keith Rollman again noted that world standards tend to indicate that it tracks with the engineering and not the philosophy majors. There is a reason they picked engineers because they track with the economy. Pamela commented that the task force debated about this same issue at the last meeting and her opinions changed based on Keith Rollman's comments. Keith Kurahashi made a request to the Chair to take a vote and rule with the majority. Chair Kokubun asked for a general consensus by a show of hands on keeping the indicators measuring percentage of science- and technology-based workers and number of post-secondary science and engineering students. A majority of the members voted in favor of keeping the indicators; Representative Chong opposed. Chair Kokubun noted that the indicators will be included for now but subject to input and revision if needed.

The Environment and Natural Resources

Chair Kokubun commented that at the last meeting task force members raised questions on some of the strategic actions and indicators and requested HIPA to seek clarification from the environmental community on those strategic actions and indicators. As a result, the environmental community added a seventh strategic action to develop a comprehensive environmental mapping and measurement system to evaluate the overall health and status of Hawai'i's natural ecosystem. Bill also added that they clarified the language for all of the indicators. Chair Kokubun referred members to the handout entitled, Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Plan, Draft 7.0. Bill noted that the strategic action would be added upon the task force's approval. Pamela inquired if there were recommended measurements for the strategic action or would the measurement be to do what the strategic action states. Representative Yamane clarified that the task force was being asked to add in the new strategic action. Bill confirmed. Representative Yamane recommended that due to time constraints, the task force consider the new strategic action for now and vote on it later. Chair Kokubun commented that there should be some indicators on how to measure the strategic action and not have it free standing and suggested not acting upon it today and request the environmental group to provide indicators for the strategic action. Beth commented that seven strategic actions for this goal is much more than in any other goal. Pamela expressed concerns that the plan could be perceived as environmental. Pamela commented if the plan should also note that the number of strategic actions and indicators does not reflect upon the importance of the section—because one goal has more strategic actions or indicators from another does not mean it is more important. Brad commented that he would be in favor of adding the new strategic action because it addresses an ecological function. The closest strategic action

would be no. 5, but would like to see something directly addressing ecological functions like flood zones and aquifer rechargers. It is implied in some areas but not explicitly. Chair Kokubun asked Brad to work with Bill to incorporate it into one of the strategic actions so that it is applicable and understandable. Chair Kokubun thanked Brad for providing the task force with a better understanding of the intent of the strategic action but felt that since it was presented to the task force today, there needs to be more discussion on the matter. Beth commented that if you take out “environmental” from the strategic action, then it can be applicable to all goals. Keith Kurahashi commented that Brad’s concerns could be addressed in strategic action no. 4.

Community and Social Well-Being

Chair Kokubun commented that the goal statement will be revised, as requested earlier in the meeting, to reflect a more positive perspective. In the third strategic action, Keith Rollman commented that the infrastructure “crisis point” that needs fixing is not wastewater treatment facilities, but wastewater collection systems—what needs to be replaced are the pipes. Keith Kurahashi suggested removing “treatment.” Keith Rollman commented that he did not want the emphasis put on the wrong end of the equation and suggested using “wastewater systems.” Brad suggested including recreation facilities and a public access component in the first paragraph. Keith Kurahashi questioned if another strategic action for recreation needs to be added. Chair Kokubun asked Brad to work with Bill to develop a strategic action and indicators. Chair Kokubun conferred with Representative Yamane if strategic action no 4 addressed his earlier concerns with public education. Representative Yamane has no objections.

Senator Menor commented on the need to be more specific, in terms of the indicators. For example, the first indicator measures housing stock that is “affordable” and we need to clarify that when we speak of housing stock there is housing stock “for purchase” and “for rent.” Also, when we speak of “affordable,” the question becomes what is affordable at different income levels. Lastly, for the second initiative, residential home ownership is usually perceived as single-family home ownership but there are also condominiums and townhouses. Chair Kokubun reiterated that the first initiative will be clarified to identify housing stock for purchase and for rent, affordable at different income levels, and in accordance with HUD guidelines and standards and the second initiative would clarify single family dwelling and primary residence. Senator Menor agreed. Representative Colleen Meyer suggested an indicator showing a decrease in homelessness. Chair Kokubun suggested gathering more information on the issue.

Kanaka Maoli Culture and Island Values

Chair Kokubun suggested using broader language, like including but not limited to, in the fourth paragraph of the opening narrative. There are many other ethnicities and they shouldn’t feel that they are excluded. Representative Yamane suggested that the ethnic groups be listed in alphabetical order. Chair Kokubun also added that in the second paragraph, the concept of “aloha aina” should not be limited to just land but also includes the ocean, air, etc. Pamela suggested including Hispanic in the list of ethnic groups—there is a large population on Maui.

XII. Ensuring Implementation and Accountability (pages 62-65):

Chair Kokubun commented that this section clearly reflects what the Accountability Working Group proposed and what was agreed upon earlier. Chair Kokubun shared with the task force some ideas which have come forth such as redefining the role of the Office of State Planning as a department, which would require constitutional amendment, and create a Department of Sustainability and Planning. Representative Yamane suggested that the list of possible dedicated funding sources be deleted. Chair Kokubun commented that we need to emphasize that there are *possible* sources of funding and suggested that for now the list be deleted but state a need for funding and once input is received, then supply a list. Marion Higa recalled that the discussion by the working group was to look for a *dedicated* funding source, not an appropriation request to the legislature year to year or session to session. Chair Kokubun asked Representative Yamane if he would agree to keeping the list in for now and see what comments are received from community input. Representative Yamane agreed. Jeffrey had concerns with the composition of the council being specific and what happens if changes are needed in the future. Chair Kokubun responded that there will be opportunities for change, for example, if part of the statutes, then it can be changed every session.

Appendix I. Summary of Hawai‘i’s Existing Planning Process (pages 66-69):

Chair Kokubun commented that the appendix basically summarizes the different plans. Chair Kokubun also acknowledged that discussion on county plans would be taken up later but he believes there was productive discussion and would like to take action on the draft plan.

Chair Kokubun entertained a motion to adopt the draft plan with the understanding that it is still subject to amendment. Pamela Tumpap moved to adopt the draft plan as amended, Representative Meyer seconded the motion. The task force unanimously approved the adoption of the draft plan, as amended.

- IV. Report on Other Activities.** Chair Kokubun reminded members of the upcoming Hawai‘i 2050 Summit to be held on Saturday, September 22, 2007 at the Hilton Hawaiian Village Coral Ballroom and also the Youth Summit which will be held on Friday, September 21, 2007 at the Neal Blaisdell Center. Jeanne Schultz Afuvai referred to the Summit handouts distributed to the task force—Summit Program, transportation schedule between the airport and Hilton Hawaiian Village, and volunteer assignments. Jeanne thanked everyone who accepted to be part of the program. She also acknowledged and thanked all of the volunteers for their support in making the Summit a success.

Bill Kaneko informed task force members that the Girl Scouts of Hawai‘i is coordinating the Youth Summit. They are working with Ramsay Taum and Sustain Hawai‘i to put together a program that will engage our youth in sustainability and seek their input on what they see in Hawai‘i’s sustainable future. Their input will be summarized in a report to be presented to the task force. Chair Kokubun suggested that the students be provided with some kind of background information on what the task force has done so far. A

questionnaire and blog are being developed to solicit feedback via KIDS Voting. The Girl Scouts would also like our youth to be involved with other activities after the summit. They will work with students to get involved with the various community meetings and possibly testifying at the upcoming legislative session. Senator Jill Tokuda commented that the Hawai'i State Student Council has contacted her that they are interested in being involved in this sustainability effort. Unfortunately, information on the Summits were not communicated well throughout the DOE system and they only recently became aware of the upcoming Summits and were afraid that it may be too late to get their students excused from their classes. They would like to be informed of any way that they can provide input on this process.

Bill reviewed the timeline for the completion of the sustainability plan with the task force. The final plan is due to the Legislature by December 21, 2007, the required 20 days prior to the start of the 2008 Legislative Session. From now until December 21, the following actions need to be completed:

- a. Approval of the draft Hawai'i 2050 plan..... September 13, 2007
- b. Hawai'i 2050 Summit..... September 22, 2007
- c. Phone and web opinion polls September 22 to October 13, 2007
- d. Community engagement meetings..... September 25 to October 13, 2007
- e. Reports from phone/web polls and CENovember 5, 2007
- f. Phone/web polls and CE reports to task forceNovember 12, 2007
- g. Task force meeting to review reports and approve HIPA recommendationsNovember 15, 2007
- h. Final revision to plan, layout begins December 7, 2007
- i. Task force meeting to approve final plan December 14, 2007
- j. Submit final plan to 2008 Legislature..... December 21, 2007

Representative Pono Chong inquired what happens after the plan is submitted to the Legislature. Bill responded that the plan will be presented to the community in January and February and continue to provide assistance with public testimony and responding to questions from the Legislature. Marion Higa clarified that if legislation is needed to be drafted as a result of the plan, the Office of the Auditor will arrange for the Legislative Reference Bureau to draft necessary legislation for introduction by subject matter chairs or leadership. Representative Chong also inquired if the task force would approve a request for legislation. Chair Kokubun responded that the task force should consider creating a Legislative Working Group and suggested having discussion on the matter at the end of this meeting.

Keith Rollman provided information on sustainability efforts by the City and County of Honolulu. Mayor Hannemann recently announced the City's first operational sustainability plan which is available online at www.honolulu.gov/mayor which will link you to a pdf file of the document. This is the first time the City has had all 12 affected departments work together at the operational level to set goals, examine technologies, and produce one document where all city operations are presented collectively. All

documents and reports will be posted online and reviewed every six months and republished annually. He encouraged task force members to visit the website.

Chair Kokubun moved discussion back to agenda item 3, Discussion and Approval of the Hawai‘i 2050 Draft Plan.

- V.** Next Steps; Plan for Future Meetings. Chair Kokubun suggested including as an agenda item for the next meeting the creation of a Legislative Work Group. The next meeting is planned for mid October. The task force will be informed when the date, time, and location have been finalized.
- VI.** Adjourn. Chair Kokubun thanked task force members and the audience for their continued participation in this sustainability effort. The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.