

**Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force
Hawai'i State Capitol, Room 414
December 14, 2007
Minutes**

Members Present: Senator Russell Kokubun, Representative Pono Chong, Ian Costa, Senator Mike Gabbard, David Goode, Marion Higa, Jeffrey Hunt, Millie Kim, Keith Kurahashi, Brad Kurokawa, Senator Ron Menor, Representative Colleen Meyer, Keith Rollman, James Spencer, Stacie Thorlakson, Beth Tokioka, Senator Jill Tokuda, Representative Ryan Yamane

Members Not Present: Representative Lyla Berg, Henry Eng, Karl Kim, Jane Testa, Michael Tresler, Pamela Tumpap

I. Call to Order. A quorum was established. Chair Russell Kokubun called the meeting of the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Task Force to order at 1:25 p.m. on Friday, December 14, 2007 at the Hawai'i State Capitol in Room 414.

II. Review and Approve of Minutes. Before opening discussion on the minutes, Chair Russell Kokubun noted that at a previous meeting, a summary of the Business Leadership Council's November 7, 2007 meeting was revised to reflect that Mr. David Arakawa, Executive Director of the Land Use Research Foundation, was present at the meeting. His name was inadvertently omitted from the list of attending participants. The meeting summary also includes Mr. Arakawa's comments, which are noted by the shaded paragraphs. A "Revised" summary of the November 7, 2007 meeting of the Business Leadership Council was distributed to task force members and are so noted in this minutes.

Chair Kokubun commented that there seemed to be some confusion with respect to the composition of the Sustainability Council and how it was recorded in the minutes. In the discussion of the Sustainability Council on pages 12 and 13, there was some confusion on the total number of members serving on the Council. There was wide discussion on the number of members and ex-officio non-voting members and a diverse membership base. The November 13, 2007 draft minutes distributed to task force recorded the composition of the Council at 15 voting members, and including two non-voting ex-officio members, one each from the Department of Education and the Office of State Planning. Bill Kaneko expressed to Chair Kokubun that he thought the task force agreed to increase the number of voting members to 17 and include the two non-voting ex-officio members. Chair Kokubun opened discussion from task force members on clarification. David Goode inquired if the taped recordings of the meeting were listened to for clarification. Chair Kokubun noted that the minutes were recorded from the tapes. Bill recalled that to address the issue of having a more diverse group, membership was increased to 17 voting members and also added the two non-voting ex officio members. Chair Kokubun

suggested that, unless members objected, the composition of the Council shall be 15 voting members and two non-voting ex officio members as reflected in the meeting tapes and draft minutes. Millie Kim clarified that the total number of members would be 17. Chair Kokubun agreed. Ian Costa shared his thoughts that a member of the Council would be a representative of the host culture. Chair Kokubun responded saying that was the intent of having the Office of Hawaiian Affairs appoint one member. Dr. James Spencer clarified that the terms of the Council member would be staggered. Chair Kokubun confirmed.

Chair Kokubun entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Dr. James Spencer moved to approve the minutes; Millie Kim seconded the motion. The task force unanimously approved the minutes of the November 13, 2008 task force meeting.

III. Legislative Work Group Report. A summary report from the Legislative Work Group’s November 27, 2007 meeting was distributed to members. Chair Russell Kokubun thanked members of the work group for their contributions to this effort. Key issues discussed at the meeting addressed the proposed legislation, 10 priority actions identified by the task force, Sustainability Council, and the Council’s funding source. A copy of the proposed legislation to be introduced at the 2008 Legislative Session was also distributed. Chair Kokubun noted that the legislation did not include specific indicators so that if the indicators should change, new legislation would not be needed to reflect any future changes. The legislation proposes to add a new chapter on sustainability plan under Title 13. Chair Kokubun commented that since many voiced concern that the funding source should not come from a special fund, the proposed legislation seeks an appropriation from the general fund. A proposed budget for the Sustainability Council was distributed to the task force.

Beth Tokioka inquired if the language regarding the governor’s appointments, paragraph (b)(2) on page 8 of the proposed legislation, implied that senate confirmation is required. Sarah Akinaka from the Senate Majority Attorney’s Office responded that it is implied but could be included to make clear that senate confirmation is needed. Chair Kokubun suggested that the statute that requires senate confirmation should be cited in the legislation. Chair Kokubun asked members if there were any objections to including the statute. No objections from members. David Goode inquired if the Council members who are nominated by the mayors also need to go through the senate confirmation process. Sarah responded that when the nominees are selected, they must also go through the confirmation process. Chair Kokubun informed Sarah that discussions earlier in the meeting confirmed that the task force had agreed that the composition of the Council would be a total of 17 members—15 voting members and 2 non-voting ex officio members—and not 19 members as reflected in the proposed legislation. Chair Kokubun instructed Sarah to revise the legislation to reflect a total of 17 members—page 8, paragraph (b)(2) should reflect “Nine” instead of “Eleven.”

Senator Jill Tokuda commented on the inclusion of the military as an area of expertise. She recently attended a council meeting where it was mentioned that military personnel cannot serve on state government boards, commissions, etc. Kirsten Baumgard Turner

clarified that the information provided at the meeting was not quite accurate and that the military as an area of expertise could still remain in the legislation but further clarification should be sought. Millie Kim clarified if all nomination, whether made by the county mayors or the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, would still need to be forwarded to the Governor, who would then submit the names to the Senate for confirmation. Chair Kokubun asked Sarah to clarify the mayors' and OHA's appointments with regards to Senate confirmation and if needed, amend the bill as necessary.

Representative Pono Chong commented that he has reservations on the codification of the plan.

Senator Tokuda asked for clarification on the number of task force members who would serve on the newly created Sustainability Council and commented that the bill states that seven task force members shall serve on the Council. Marion Higa responded that the number of task force members would be five and explained that earlier discussions clarified that the Council would be comprised of a total of 17 members—15 voting members and 2 non-voting ex officio members. She further explained that the legislation was drafted on the assumption that the total number of members was 19—17 voting and 2 non-voting ex officio. At the start of the meeting, Chair Kokubun confirmed with task force members that the total number of members serving on the Council was 17 and that the legislation would be revised as needed to address this change. Senator Tokuda clarified that the task force members who serve on the newly created Council would need to be nominated by the mayors or OHA and meet the criteria of being an expert in one of the identified interest areas.

Marion confirmed and added that there may be more than five task force members who would qualify to serve on the Council and in that case, the governor would have to select only five. Dr. James Spencer commented that the draft plan states that there should be “at least” five current task force members, but the legislation states the specific number of five. Marion commented that the original intent was not to have the “transitional” Council be comprised to too many task force members. Senator Tokuda expressed concerns on the complexity on how the members of the initial Council would be appointed.

Representative Chong inquired on the reason to codify the plan. Chair Kokubun responded that there should be a need to respect what has taken place—similar to how the State Plan and 12 Functional Plans were codified. Chair Kokubun asked Representative Chong what are his objections to codifying the plan. Representative Chong questioned whether the original intent was to create something that would be codified. He has concerns that if the plan becomes state law and there is a conflict between the State or 12 Functional Plans and the Sustainability Plan, which one would take precedence. Mille responded that would be the responsibility of the Council and the Council would need to be established by law. Representative Chong clarified that he believes that establishing a Council is different from codifying the plan. He observed that it is rare that a legislative task force's plan is codified and adds a different dimension to the process.

Beth questioned if Act 8 stated what the final disposition of the product should be or did it ask the task force submit a plan. Representative Chong responded that the act requested that the task force report back to the legislature. Chair Kokubun responded that the task force was requested to submit a sustainability plan. David inquired if the legislature could adopt a resolution stating that this is the initial sustainability plan to be presented to the Sustainability Council. Chair Kokubun confirmed and added that since the State Plan and 12 Functional Plans were adopted into our statutes, why should the Sustainability Plan be any different. Senator Ron Menor commented that he had no objection to codifying the plan but questioned the interrelationship between the Sustainability Plan and the State and 12 Functional Plans since they would still be part of the statutes. He asked if the Sustainability Plan supersede the State and Functional Plans? Senator Menor also inquired if the legislative work group considered amending or updating the State and Functional Plans instead of creating a new chapter. If the intent is for the Sustainability Plan to take precedence, is it necessary to keep the State and Functional Plans on the books? Chair Kokubun responded that initial discussions on how to proceed with this task, members expressed the desire to “honor” the State Plan and 12 Functional Plans and the work involved in creating the plans and not to repeal them.

Tom Smyth, an audience member, commented on earlier discussions on council membership saying that there is an official military liaison assigned to the Board of Education and is listed on every agenda as a speaker, but they cannot be a member of the board. He also commented that usually members of a board or council are the heads of the department or agency or their designee and noticed that similar language is not included in the composition of the Council’s membership. He also pointed out that the AG had stated that a “designee” had to be a member of the department or agency; therefore, in the case of OHA, it would have to be someone working for OHA and not someone from the Hawaiian community. Lastly, he commented that you may want to include a provision for staff to be hired outside of Chapter 76. Chair Kokubun agreed that the proposed legislation should state that ex-officio members shall be head of the DOE and OSP or their designee. Tom commented that regarding the DOE, the task force should verify whether the member should be the superintendent or the chair of the board.

Kirsten commented on Senator Menor’s concerns about integrating the plans saying that the Army also encountered similar issues with their sustainability strategic plan and various federal regulations. From the start, the Army identified conflicts between the existing strategic plan and the sustainability strategic plan and had them resolved and integrated the planning process.

Ian Costa inquired if standard language was used in section 6 regarding powers of the council. Chair Kokubun responded that standard language was used and clarified that liability is not with individual members. Marion informed the task force that once the bill is introduced, members will be informed by either her office or HIPA on the bill number and any other information on the bill so that members will be able to track it through the legislative process. Information on other sustainability related measures will also be forwarded.

IV. Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Final Plan Discussion and Approval. Bill Kaneko suggested following the summary outline, which was distributed to members, to discuss the various changes to the plan.

Bill highlighted structural and formatting changes to the plan, many of which are in response to concerns voiced at the community meetings.

- Process section placed after the plan.
- Executive Summary added.
- New section added addressing community requests to have intermediate “next steps.” This section will include priority areas, targets or benchmarks, and responsible agency. (More discussion needed to approve top 10 priority actions.)
- New section added addressing various concepts, such as ahupua‘a, education, etc.
- Included language on the inter-dependence and inter-connection between the five goals.
- Include more graphics and data.
- Expand the section on critical issues to include discussion on population growth and carrying capacity.
- Deleted section on political will.
- Streamlined the process section.

Background and Origins of Hawai'i 2050 (page 9): Issues leading up to the plan. The chart summarizing community participation over the year and a half planning process will be moved up front to emphasize the fact that this was a community-based effort.

Critical Concepts: A User's Guide to Hawai'i 2050 (page 12): Highlights major concepts of the plan: Kanaka Maoli, ahupua‘a, value of education, “living document,” and relationship with other planning efforts.

What is Sustainability? The People's Definition (page 14): The definition and guiding principles remained the same; the vision was expanded to include benchmarks and the term “index” was changed to “indicators.”

Goals, Strategic Actions and Indicators (page 17): Included narrative on the integration and inter-dependence of the five goals and how education does not have its own goal but part of each goal.

Goal 1: A Way of Life (page 19): Greater emphasis on youth involvement, participation, and education; and that sustainability is the responsibility of all citizens.

Before getting further into the plan's goals, Chair Russell Kokubun entertained discussion or comments on items covered so far. Marion Higa suggested listing former task force members as well as the current members. Millie Kim clarified that the number of attendees to the various community engagement meetings (page 75) is larger than the 10,520 if you include attendees to the “Other Community Outreach Activities.”

Bill indicated that strategic action #2 was reworked to make it cleaner and added a column to the indicators noting the possible lead state agency. Chair Kokubun inquired if the lead agencies would be responsible for measuring the indicators. Bill responded that they would have primary responsibility in terms of the subject matter as it relates to the goals. Senator Jill Tokuda had concerns that using the heading “Lead State Agency” could imply that the agency identified would be responsible for accomplishing the specified goal. She added that the use of “Lead State Agency” may need to be changed if the intent is to indicate the sources where information to quantify the indicators would be obtained from. County agencies may also be involved.

Bill suggested using “Data Sources” as a heading. Chair Kokubun asked members if anyone had objections to using “Data Sources” as the new heading. No one objected. Senator Ron Menor shared concerns that the “data sources” need to be accurately identified and commented that there may be a number of sources that could provide various types of data or statistics for a particular indicator and not be listed as a data source. Senator Tokuda suggested using the heading “Possible Data Sources.” Senator Menor and James Spencer questioned having the column at all commenting that the listed sources may have conflicting data or statistics. Representative Pono Chong suggested providing a list of possible sources instead of just one. Keith Kurahashi commented that column should remain as some kind of guidance for the Council but include in the narrative that these are possible sources and that there may be others.

Goal 2: The Economy (page 26): Major themes voiced at the community meetings—respect for mature industries, need for economic diversification and well-trained workforce, and functioning infrastructure—were integrated into the narrative.

As a result of community feedback on agricultural production, changes were made to Strategic Action 1, second bulleted arrow. To address the issue of economic diversification, discussion was expanded in the narrative and the sustainability-related industries footnote from the previous draft was added to Strategic Action 1, first bulleted arrow. To respond to the community’s question as to why tourism and the military were part of the plan, the opening narrative clarified the need for mature industries to become sustainable. The issue of infrastructures was addressed in both Goal 2 and Goal 4. The strategic actions were combined in Goal 2, Strategic Action 4.

Senator Tokuda liked the graphics in the goals and suggested adding captions to the graphs. Bill agreed. Millie suggested showing, where available, the U.S. average so the reader could quick see if Hawai‘i is ahead or behind the average. James commented that if a graph shows progression that is too small, it may need to be presented differently so that the reader is able to see that there is a reasonable amount of change. Representative Chong inquired how the agencies were selected—was that where the data was found? Bill responded that the agencies identified for each indicator will change since it was earlier agreed upon that the column would identify possible data sources instead of the lead state agency.

Goal 3: The Environment and Natural Resources (page 36): This section addresses protecting Hawai‘i’s environment, energy, and global warming. A new bullet was added to Strategic Action 1 to address adoption of sustainable practices.

Representative Chong suggested including counties in the strategic action and not only state agencies. Bill expressed concerns that the counties may have an issue with the plan “telling” them what to do. Representative Chong responded that since there are county representatives on this task force, he presumed that the strategic actions would have their support. He then suggested using “encourage governmental” instead of “require state.” David Goode commented that if “encourage” is used, the counties would support it. Brad Kurokawa commented that if the government doesn’t take the lead, it is very difficult to encourage others to change. The task force agreed to revise the bullet to read “Encourage government agencies....”

Strategic Action 2 was expanded to include prior discussions that the strategic action should go beyond water conservation. The narrative was expanded to address concerns regarding watersheds, infrastructure, and other water issues but no new strategic actions were added. Bill asked the task force if a new strategic action is needed. James inquired if our aging infrastructure has any relation to Hawai‘i having the highest water consumption per capita. Beth Tokioka commented that the Issue Book noted that our high water consumption was due to our warm climate and the fact that we water all year round and also our agricultural use.

Strategic Action 3 was expanded to include reuse activities and waste reduction strategies. Strategic Action 4 included air quality and air related issues. Strategic Action 7 was added to address environmental mapping and measurement system. The indicator addressing invasive species was modified to include intra-island migration.

Goal 4: Community and Social Well-Being (page 47): Caring for the elderly and the need to make critical choices were some concerns which arose from meetings held with the health and human services groups.

The first bullet for Strategic Action 1 was revised by deleting “Review and.” Strategic Action 2 which originally addressed traffic congestion was modified to address public transportation infrastructure and alternatives and the reduction of traffic congestion was moved to a bullet item. Chair Kokubun commented that an issue raised with respect to the Superferry was that there are no plans for inter-island transportation.

Two bullet items were added to Strategic Action 1 to strengthen the nonprofit sector and reduce crime and violence (drug abuse was redundant therefore deleted). Senator Tokuda recalled that at a previous discussion, the task force agreed to move the second bullet in Strategic Action 2 to Strategic Action 1 since it was applicable to not only students but adults as well. She also recommended that “high school drop out rates” be deleted from the last sentence in narrative of Strategic Action 1 since it is a bullet item in Strategic Action 3. Senator Tokuda would also like to include support for caregivers in the third bullet of Strategic Action 1. Beth suggested adding another bullet item in Strategic

Action 1 to address ensuring access for persons with disabilities. Bill noted the following revisions: (1) the deletion of the reference to social and human services in the third bullet which the human services group agreed with and (2) the expansion of the fourth bullet to include mental health.

Strategic Action 3 was expanded to include parenting (first bullet). Keith Kurahashi suggested adding another bullet to address support of vocational education at the high school level. Senator Tokuda expressed some concern with using the term “vocational” and suggested “technical education and career pathways,” for example, support or strengthen career paths in our schools. Keith Kurahashi concurred. Chair Kokubun commented that there is no bullet item addressing post-secondary education but there is an indicator measuring high schools student continuing on with post-secondary education. Keith Kurahashi noted that post-secondary education is addressed in Goal 2, Strategic Action 3 but also added that it still could be mentioned here.

Kirsten Baumgard Turner agreed with Keith Kurahashi and suggested having a bullet item that supports other strategic actions in other goals. A member of the audience suggested using the term “multiuse pathways and bikeways” to be more inclusive in Strategic Action 2. He would also like the term “improve” be replaced with “increase.” Senator Suzanne Chun Oakland suggested including in Strategic Action 1’s narrative the aspect of the care of our youth, families, and the elderly.

Ian Costa added to the comment of multi-use pathways and bikeways suggesting enhancing, improving or increasing multi-modal transportation opportunities. He also added that he agrees with Senator Tokuda’s suggestion and concerns with vocation education. Bill suggested the following language to address Ian’s concerns, “Increase opportunities for multi-modal transportation.” Chair Kokubun suggested added language to include multi-use pathways and facilities. Brad commented that the proper term is “balance transportation.”

James suggested adding to Strategic Action 3 a bullet addressing distance learning types of opportunities.

Bill summarized the discussion with the following:

- Expand narrative to include children, youth, and families and delete reference to high school dropout rates
- Strategic Action 1:
 - mention caregivers in the area of long-term care and elderly housing
 - delete drug abuse in bullet addressing crime and violence
 - new bullet addressing access for persons with disabilities
- Strategic Action 2:
 - replace third bullet with increased opportunities for multi-modal transportation, including multi-use pathways and facilities
- Strategic Action 3:
 - revise language for second bullet to Strategic Action 1

- new bullet addressing strengthening career pathways for technical education that are consistent with our economic workforce goals
- new bullet addressing strengthening post-secondary education
- new bullet addressing encouragement of distance learning

Senator Menor commented that as discussion continues, additional issues are being raised and considered for inclusion in the plan. He suggests that it be noted in the plan that the strategic actions and indicators presented in the plan can and may be changed and other issues may be addressed as they arise. Beth commented that it is noted up front in the plan that this is a living document and can or will be changed as time goes on. Senator Menor suggested adding another bullet item in Strategic Action 1 to address the support of programs that assist family and children in need. He also suggested addressing support for extra-curriculum activities under Strategic Action 3.

Senator Mike Gabbard commented that encouraging residents to utilize various telecommunication methods could be an alternative in reducing traffic congestion. He stated that between 19-20 percent federal employees in Washington D.C. work from home.

Jeff Hunt reminded the task force of the spirit of this document, how it started out, and how it evolved. The plan could not address all issues of concern and the task force agreed to focus on key issues and indicators, but Jeff noted that discussions seem to be deviating from the task force's original philosophy for the plan. Chair Kokubun agreed that discussions seem to be moving away from the original task but also noted that the ideas suggested are valid and that this may be one of the downside of trying to put a plan like this together.

Kirsten suggested taking all that was discussed and keep to the spirit of the plan. Broader statements would capture many of the issues addressed in the discussion.

Goal 5: Kanaka Maoli Culture and Island Values (page 57): The definition of Kanaka Maoli was explained more fully in this section and a new Strategic Action 5 was added addressing Kanaka Maoli education for new residents, visitors, and the general public.

Ian suggested deleting the word “new” before residents.

Priority Actions and Intermediate Steps: Target Date 2020 (page 63): Bill asked task force members to carefully review the priority actions and comment on the targeted benchmarks and lead government agencies.

1) Increase affordable housing opportunities for households up to 140% of median income. (Goal 4, Strategic Action 1)

Benchmark: 95 percent of Hawai'i residents will have “adequate housing”
Where we are now: 76.2 percent of Hawai'i residents have “adequate housing”

David inquired if the data presented was from a recurring study. Bill responded that the data was from a study conducted by SMS Research in 2006. David expressed concerns that he was not familiar with the data source and the data may not be followed by state and national levels. Bill welcomed suggestions from task force members for other benchmarks, indicators, or measurements that would achieve this goal. Chair Kokubun suggested using data that show the number of units based on the number of people that fall under that category. David commented that the Census data probably contain percentages of homeownership. Keith Kurahashi commented that the language used for “Why this matters:” seem to target the 140% of median income instead of the *up to* 140% of median income as was discussed at previous meetings. He suggested using the language, “for middle gap and low-income levels,” for “we will not have a middle class, and.” Beth inquired if rental units were also included in the data provided in the study by the Hawaii Housing Policy Forum 2006. Bill confirmed. Chair Kokubun noted the importance that these indicators need to be measurable in years to come.

Senator Menor suggested using the term “possible” government agency so not to imply that there is only one agency. Bill clarified that the lead government agency was not a data source but the agency that would coordinate or take a lead role in implementing the strategic action. Senator Menor commented that it would take more than one agency to implement each goal. Chair Kokubun commented that the Sustainability Council may be tasked with determining the responsible agency to achieve these goals. The task force agreed to delete the lead government agencies from each indicator.

2) Strengthen public education. (Goal 2, Strategic Action 3; Goal 4, Strategic Action 4)

Benchmark: 60 percent of public school students score at or above the “proficient level” on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) tests

Where we are now: 24 percent of our students are at or above “proficient” in mathematics, 21 percent for reading, 19 percent for science, and 16 percent for writing

Bill welcomed suggestions for other benchmarks that tie into this indicator, such as high school drop out rates. Beth commented if DOE has their own benchmarks and if so, is this indicator consistent with DOE. Chair Kokubun suggested high school students continuing with post-secondary education as another measurement.

3) Reduce reliance on fossil fuels (Goal 3, Strategic Action 2)

Benchmark: 35 percent of Hawai‘i energy is generated from renewable sources

Where we are now: 5-8 percent of our energy is from renewable sources

Beth again expressed concern on consistency since there is a law that mandates that 20 percent of Hawai‘i’s energy be generated from renewable sources by the year 2020. Senator Menor clarified that the RPS law refers to utilities and questioned if this was 35 percent of the entire energy use. Keith Rollman commented that the way written, it pertains to energy from electrical generation and suggested adding a second benchmark

to address transportation fuels. Chair Kokubun agreed with David to measurement the importation of barrels of oil per capita.

4) Increase recycling, reuse and waste reduction strategies (Goal 3, Strategic Action 3)

Benchmark: 75 percent of Hawai‘i’s municipal solid waste will be recycled

Where we are now: Hawai‘i’s recycling rate is approximately 25 percent of its solid waste

Keith Rollman commented that most municipalities measure diversion rate, which means you do something with the solid waste instead of putting it in the landfill. If you want to measure recycling, you need to define recycling—waste-to-energy recycling, material recovery recycling, shipping off island recycling, etc. There is no industrial base for recycling on O‘ahu—glass is not made back into glass, plastic is not made back into plastic—we collect, sort, and get rid of it. David suggested having two benchmarks—diversion and overall waste reduction. Keith Kurahashi suggested deleting “municipal” from the benchmark.

5) Develop a more diverse and resilient economy (Goal 2, Strategic Action 1)

Benchmark: The technology and agriculture sectors comprise of 15 percent of the total economy

Where we are now:

Bill apologized for this priority action being incomplete. Chair Kokubun sought input from Tom Smyth, a member of the audience. Tom confirmed that technology and agriculture sectors are well measured by DBEDT and the Department of Agriculture, respectively. Keith Kurahashi suggested measuring technology and agriculture separately.

6) Identify, prioritize and fund infrastructure “crisis points” that need fixing (Goal 2, Strategic Action 4)

Benchmark: Fewer than 10 percent of Hawai‘i’s major roads will be in poor or mediocre condition; fewer than 10 percent of Hawai‘i’s bridges will be structurally deficient or functionally obsolete; wastewater infrastructure will be rebuilt; and no deficient dams

Where we are now: 65 percent of Hawai‘i’s major roads are in poor or mediocre condition; 47 percent of Hawai‘i’s bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete; Hawai‘i has \$1.74 billion in wastewater infrastructure needs; and there are 22 state-determined deficient dams in Hawai‘i

Beth expressed deep concerns with this priority action due to the fact that these are extremely large cost items and most fall on the counties. She is not sure if twelve years is enough time to accomplish these marks. Brad commented that the roads on Hawai‘i Island would lower the State’s average quickly. Keith Rollman commented that to rebuild O‘ahu’s wastewater infrastructure to EPA standards, it would cost approximately

\$3 billion. Keith Kurahashi has some concerns with the percentage goals for the year 2020—if currently 65 percent of the roads are in poor condition, is it realistic to set a goal of less than 10 percent of our road in poor condition by the year 2020. Chair Kokubun suggested that another way to measure could be by capital improvement moneys being spent.

Chair Kokubun suggested deferring agreement for this priority action.

7) Develop a sustainability ethic (Goal 1, Strategic Action 1)

Benchmark: 75 percent of Hawai‘i residents consider sustainability to be a “critically important” issue

Where we are now: No benchmark data on this polling question is available yet.

Representative Colleen Meyer had concerns that 75 percent may be a too optimistic benchmark to meet. Keith Kurahashi believes that if the percentage goal is reached then we haven’t done our job—if 75 percent of residents are concerned with sustainability by 2020, then we haven’t reached some of our goals to make it less of a concern. Keith Rollman commented that some of the benchmarks set may sound reasonable for 2020 but bad solutions for 2050. For example, highways or mass transit—highways may be reasonable for 2020 but if you put more vehicles on the road, mass transit may be a better solution for 2050. Keith Kurahashi suggested measuring the number of residents practicing sustainability at home—water conservation, recycling, etc.

8) Increase production and consumption of local foods and products, particularly agricultural products (Goal 2, Strategic Action 2)

Benchmark: Half of all of the food consumed locally is grown locally

Where we are now: Between 80 and 90 percent of Hawai‘i’s food is imported

Keith Kurahashi suggested consulting with the Farm Bureau if this goal is realistic or consistent with their goals—it may be difficult to encourage residents to farm. Chair Kokubun suggested changing the language to “reduce our import of foods.”

9) Provide access to long-term care and elderly housing (Goal 4, Strategic Action 1)

Benchmark: Hawai‘i will have 65 long-term care beds per 1,000 population; fewer than 20 percent of Hawai‘i’s elderly renters will experience “affordability problems”

Where we are now: Hawai‘i’s bed rate of 24 beds per 1,000 residents aged 65 and older; is almost one-half that of the U.S. rate of 43 beds per 1,000 population aged 65 and older. 49 percent of Hawai‘i’s elderly renters will experience “affordability problems”

David inquired if the number is identified by demographics. Bill commented that we are responding to what the community wants but in-depth discussions will be with the Council. We are caught with trying to meet the community’s needs and being realistic on what can be achieved. We need to be clear that these are aspirational goals. Keith

Kurahashi commented that at the same time, we do not want the experts to criticize that these goals are unrealistic. Keith Rollman added that the community believes everything is important and should be top priority. Chair Kokubun suggested seeking input from Senator Les Ihara and Representative Marilyn Lee who co-chair a joint long-term care committee.

10) Preserve and perpetuate our Kanaka Maoli and island cultural values (Goal 5, Strategic Actions 1 and 2)

Benchmark: Number of community programs and projects that promote Hawaiian and other cultures increases by 50 percent

Where we are now: No data currently compiled

Representative Meyer commented that if there is no data compiled, what would be increased by 50 percent. James questioned if we are speaking of only community programs and projects or does it include media, movie, TV, or film projects that could achieve the same goal. Millie commented that there are cultural and tourism grants that focus on cultural festivals, events, and seminars. Chair Kokubun inquired who could provide data on these grants. Millie responded that HTA and the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts could provide the data.

Chair Kokubun returned discussion back to Priority Action 6 on infrastructure crisis points. David suggested looking at the goal from an economical perspective—how would poor conditions of our infrastructure affect the economy. Ian commented that it may be more achievable to look at increasing funding for rather than actual infrastructure deficiency. Chair Kokubun commented that the struggle with this priority action is that we really don't know what the crisis points are and what they would cost to fix. Keith Rollman commented that we sort of know what they are but how much is the public willing to pay to fix it and are we guessing correctly on which priority to put the moneys in.

Chair Kokubun commented that should the crisis points be looked at in terms of the economy or the environment. Keith Rollman responded that they are all interrelated. Bill commented that more research needs to be conducted on this priority action and they will take a look at data that is available. James suggested looking at percentage of private companies to invest in infrastructure improvements. Keith Rollman added improving the bond rating. Chair Kokubun commented that more discussion is needed and possibly removing it from the list of priority actions if agreement cannot be made. He added that the task force should be comfortable with approving a plan that will be presented to the Legislature and the general public. Keith Rollman clarified if the benchmark was being deleted but the issue still would remain. Chair Kokubun responded that as a priority action, it should be deleted. David commented that he would like to keep this as a priority action but note that the Sustainability Council will make this their top priority.

Chair Kokubun noted that if the task force agrees to keep it as priority action, it will be inconsistent with the other priority actions in terms of having a 2020 benchmark. Beth

had concerns that if no 2020 benchmark is provided, it may be difficult to receive support from the county councils—having no benchmark may stand out as an unfunded mandate. Keith Kurahashi suggested having a one percent reduction a year of roads and bridges in poor or mediocre condition and then the Council could increase the percentage as necessary. Chair Kokubun noted that this plan will be presented to the Legislature and that is where the criticism of the plan will be. Representative Meyer commented that although the percentage is low, at least it's a goal.

Chair Kokubun commented that since the task force agrees that this is an important issue but is unable to agree on a benchmark, he asked task force members if there was any objection to removing this priority action from the plan. No task force members objected.

From Planning to Action (page 67): This new section makes recommendations to implement the plan. Recommendations include focusing on top 9 priority actions; establish a Sustainability Council; create indicators; and issue progress reports. Bill noted changes made to the Sustainability Council. He confirmed the number of members on the Council—17 total: 15 voting, 2 non-voting, ex-officio. He also clarified issue of youth participation. The BOE's student member is a non-voting member and the rationale for this that the student is not at the age of majority and cannot enter into a contract or be part of a binding agency. If approved by the task force, the reference to students would be changed to youth representation and would represent Hawai'i's youth under the age of 25. An added function to the Council would be to sponsor cross-sector dialogue to address key sustainability issues. Lastly, the funding source was changed from dedicated sources to the general fund. Marion clarified that it was previously discussed that the Council would be administratively attached to the Office of the Auditor for the first two years then thereafter to the Office of Planning.

Planning Principles and Approach to Hawai'i 2050 (page 72): Streamlined.

Appendix (page 79): No change.

For task force consideration, Bill suggested including in each section, quotes from experts and community leaders.

Chair Kokubun informed task force members that the plan, as amended per discussion today, will need to be approved and forwarded to the Legislature around December 21, 2007 as a white paper. The plan will be professionally designed and publicly unveiled in early February. Chair Kokubun entertained a motion to approve the plan as amended. Ian Costa moved to approve the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Plan, as amended; Millie Kim seconded the motion. Chair Kokubun opened discussion. Stacie Thorlakson thanked HIPA, Leland Chang, Janis Reischmann, and everyone who worked towards this effort. On behalf of the task force members, Chair Kokubun also thanked the Office of the Auditor. David thanked Chair Kokubun for all his efforts. The task force unanimously approved the Hawai'i 2050 Sustainability Plan, as amended.

- V. Stakeholder Meetings Report.**
- VI. Report on Other Activities.**
- VII. Next Steps; Plan for Future Meeting.**
- VIII. Adjourn.** Chair Kokubun thanked everyone and wished all happy holidays. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.