



Sen. Russell Kokubun,
Chair

Fall Community Meeting Hale'iwa Elementary School, October 6, 2007

Rep. Lyla Berg
Rep. Pono Chong
Ian Costa
Henry Eng
Sen. Mike Gabbard
David Goode
Marion M. Higa
Jeffrey Hunt
Dr. Karl Kim
Millie Kim
Keith Kurahashi
Brad Kurokawa
Sen. Ron Menor
Rep. Colleen Meyer
Keith Rollman
Dr. James Spencer
Jane Testa
Stacie Thorlakson
Beth Tokioka
Sen. Jill Tokuda
Michael Tresler
Pamela Tumpap
Rep. Ryan Yamane

Participants

Maron Etypaea
Kathleen Flynn
Elisa Hammer
Michael Lyons
Gerry Meade
Kathleen Pahinui

Stew Ring
Taylor Rock
Anne Smoke
Jim Spencer
Keanu Young

Facilitators:

Bryan Bushley
Tricia Dang

Elizabeth Louis
Taylor Rock

Following a brief presentation of the draft plan, participants were asked to join a small “break-out group” for discussion. Each group was asked to first offer comments about the draft plan goals, strategic actions and indicators. They were asked to identify what they saw as positives – things that they thought were especially important or on point; things they thought were negatives – things they didn’t agree with or didn’t understand; and things they thought were missing. The groups were then asked to give comments on the draft implementation and accountability plan. They were asked specifically to comment on what they saw as the strengths of the proposed sustainability council; what they saw as weaknesses of the proposed sustainability council and how they might be addressed; and any other general comments they might have about the plan for implementation and accountability. Their input will be considered by the H2050 Sustainability Task Force as it revises the draft H2050 Sustainability Plan.

The goals in the draft plan are:

- Goal I – A Way of Life
- Goal II – The Economy
- Goal III – Environment and Natural Resources
- Goal IV – Community and Social Well Being
- Goal V – Kanaka Maoli Culture and Island Values

➤ Discussion: Plan goals, strategic actions and indicators

What are the positives – things that are really important or on point?

- Ongoing community meetings.
- There is a plan.
- Balance of environment, economy and society.
- Positive future, vision is ma`a.
- Indicators are adaptive.
- Outcome orientated.
- Recycling.
- Living/flexible/adaptive plan.
- Plan is good.

What are the negatives – things that you don't agree with or don't understand?

- Need more “buy-in.” Include the youth they are the future. Youth have good ideas. For traditional knowledge, go to the kūpuna.
- Go to the people; don't ask them to come to us.
- Gaps in public high school schedules and are looking for people to bring real education. This is a great opportunity for the plan.
- No true implementation yet. Where is the community & political will?
- Military accountability. Are they subject to the plan?
- How to keep all groups accountable?
- Need to finance the plan.
- Look to other areas/states for idea, i.e. California Native Americans and gambling.
- Create incentives and facilitate an ethic of sustainability. Look at issues everyone deals with, i.e. waste, taxes, etc.
- Environment first it is the median/vehicle that builds the economy
- Plan does not identify “low-hanging fruit”, there is a lack of strategy
- More accountability from military
- Low initiative from public officials
- Identify and prioritize long-term vs. short-term goals
- Education should be first priority

What do you think is missing from this section of the plan that is critical?

- Simple steps: bring your own shopping bag.
- Recycling: 80% of the people want it.



- Goal II: Environment – clean up our mess! Education on all levels, corporation → grassroots and you.
- Respect environment. Healthy environment = Healthy economy.
- Goal II: Environment – indicators okay. 3/5 broad language. How are we going to preserve agriculture and conservation land?
- How to address second home and gentlemen estates on agricultural land.
- Need implementation.
- Develop a link between compact development and land preservation.
- Water issues.
- No more Waikīkī.
- Goal 5 – mentorship/education to preserve cultural places.
- Many cultural places destroyed by resort development.
- More foresight in planning.
- Hotels and farms/fishponds.
- Look at the people
- Social development is lacking.
- More longitudinal studies on welfare.
- Capitalistic values are damaging to social fabric.
- Addressing drug – use and rehabilitation.
- Cultural, connect to their history.
- More youth participation, homeless, kūpuna, go to them at least gatherings/groups.
- Engage with schools.
- Need know-how to implement indicators.
- Need community outreach strategy.
- Need sustainability ethic.
- Put environment first as foundation for economy (1st goal/priority, not reverse).
- Clean up our mess.
- Link water as public trust to equity of use.
- Mentorship/education and preserve cultural places.
- Longer-term zoning vision.
- Preserving cultural places for next generation (through community planning).
- Integrate cultural practices and values into tourism and economy (e.g. fishponds for hotel consumption, hotels supporting farms private/local partnerships).
- Respect environment and economy will flourish.
- Broad language concerning conservation of agricultural lands and open space (how will it be implemented?).
- Encourage and invest in local agriculture and agricultural lands.
- Better define agricultural lands, for diversified farming (production agricultural).
- Focus on the people and social problems/policies (housing, education, health (mental & physical) family planning, track problems and trends.
- Address social problems through cultural education and practices.



➤ Discussion: Concept of Sustainability Council

What do you see as the strengths of the proposed Sustainability Council?

- Annual report card.
- Council full-time staff.
- Create credibility and create government reform.
- Good that high school kids, Native Hawaiians are part of the Council.

What are the shortcomings or weaknesses?

- Sense of attitude, character that reflects goals/issues independent from big biz/political.
- New, different process that isn't typically political.
- Mitigate process – create transparency.
- Questionable ability to implementation because of issues with “buy-in”.
- Youth education – effects behavior of others.
- Necessary political will.
- Lack of participation → need.
- Government financial transparency.
- Will of people affect financing of plan.
- Work from ground level to affect peoples to understand quality of life.
- What's strategy of the plan?
- Clearer profile of people in Council. Clear understanding by the public of who is the Council.
- Independent, objective representative Council members.

Other comments about the sustainability council?

- Want good representation and people with credibility who shares the values of sustainability.
- Process of selecting Council members is inevitable political.
- Hard to keep politics out of implementation.
- Children already get it. Education more and educate adults too.
- Media use to spread education.
- People need to learn how to participate democratically.
- Transparency of government and finance.
- More participation by people will ensure transparency.
- Affect people's quality of life on a personal level – example – simple things. Plastic fee in supermarkets, plastic bags in grocery stores.
- Have a strategy to build up credibility of the plan, starting small.
- Sell Hawai'i 2050 reusable grocery bags in place of plastic.



Comments Sheet

Comments on Goals, Strategic Actions, and Indicators

- Water – desalination not used but it should be.
- Recycling only half addresses to structure.
- Plastic – follow California.
- Agriculture cost too huge – no water land cost dividing ag into estates for Rick 40 year plan – too long should look at 25 year plan even that is too long the world is moving to fast.
- Traffic higher tax on newer cars.
- The world is coming to us we can't stop it.

Comments on Ensuring Implementation and Accountability

- There have been tons of reports/recommendations to the legislature for anything you can imagine – health, etc. Most sit on shelves gathering dust until something triggers the conversation again more importantly than legislative buy-in you need the “peoples” buy-in. Look at van cams – public outcry reversed a legislative decision. Most politicians aren't into policy. If this is going to work and accomplish anything it needs to be approached differently than in the past.
- If Goal II is important you must have political buy in.
- The State Law for form lots must drill your own well – you own the water and well – not public.
- Our population is going to explode. Everyone all over the world wants to come hear especially China, Korea, Mainland, etc.
- People are concerned about present quality of life, not future unless you can make the direct, urgent, tie in.

Additional Comments

- Good luck – I would love to see this plan taken seriously and implemented.