10/10/2011

1	
2	COUNTY OF MAUI, STATE OF HAWAII
3	
4	APPROVED 10/24/2011
5	
6	
7	CHARTER COMMISSION
8	REGULAR MEETING
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Held at the Planning Department Conference Room,
15	250 South High Street, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, commencing
16	at 10:00 a.m., on Monday, October 10, 2011.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Reported by: Tonya McDade, CSR, CRR
22	Certified Shorthand Reporters Maui Wells Street Professional Center
23	2145 Wells Street, Suite 302 Wailuku, Hawaii 96793
24	(808)244-3376 reporters@csrmaui.com
25	<u>r</u> - <u>-</u> - <u>-</u>

1 ATTENDANCE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Joshua A. Stone, Chair Wayne N. Hedani, Vice-Chair Artemio C. Baxa, Member Stephanie S. Crivello, Member David P. DeLeon, Member Frank R. De Rego, Jr., Member Clifford P. Hashimoto, Member Wayne N. Hedani, Member Susan A. Moikeha, Member Linda Kay Okamoto, Member Yuki Lei Sugimura, Member 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 STAFF PRESENT: Ms. Sherry P. Broder, Commission Analyst Edward Kushi, Jr., First Deputy Corporation Counsel Lisa Kahuhu, Supervising Law Technician 9 10 ADMINISTRATION PRESENT: Michael Molina, Executive Assistant to the Mayor 11 12 OTHERS PRESENT: OTHERS PRESENT:
Mary Cochran
Fire Chief Jeffrey Murray
Thomas Croly
Sylvia Cabral
Roy Vandoom
Veronica Cheromcka
Peter Davis
Bob Lightbourn
Steve Parker
Wendy Osher
Bruce Faulkner 13 14 15 16 17 18 19

10/10/2011

20 21

22

23 24

25

4

2

```
1
         We have Ed Kushi, Jr., back from sick leave. Ed, good
2
         to see you. He's our Deputy Corporation Counsel. We
3
         also have Lisa Kahuhu, again, Supervising Law
4
         Technician, Tonya McDade, our court reporter, Tonya,
5
                     And, Lisa, do we expect EA today?
6
                     MS. KAHUHU: I didn't hear, so I'm not sure.
                     CHAIR STONE: Okay. No problem. Hopefully,
7
8
         we get a EA from the Mayor's Office.
9
                     Also, I'd like to welcome Sherry Broder who is
10
         our Commission Analyst. Thank you, Sherry, for being
         here. And thank you very much to Akaku for being here
11
12
         to televise this to the public. Much appreciated.
                     MEMBER DELEON: There's Michael.
13
14
                     CHAIR STONE: Ah. And, punctually, from the
15
         Mayor's Office, Michael Molina.
16
                     MR. MOLINA: Good morning.
                     CHAIR STONE: EA to the Mayor. Thank you,
17
18
         Mike, for being here.
19
                    I would like to take this time to approve the
20
         minutes from our last meeting. Are there any -- yes,
21
         please.
22
                     MEMBER OKAMOTO: Mr. Chair, I had a question.
23
         And I don't know if anyone else can answer it. There
24
         were a couple things that I did pass over, but, on Page
25
         36, when Greg Jenkins was testifying, Line 14, 15, and
```

10/10/2011

.

1 (Monday, October 10, 2011, 10:00 a.m.) 2 3 CHAIR STONE: I would like to say hello to 4 everyone for attending this public meeting of the 5 Charter Commission. My name is Josh Stone, and I am the 6 Chairman of the Commission. If you need, there are 7 copies of today's agenda as well as copies of the 8 Charter here with Lisa Kahuhu. Lisa, could you raise 9 your hand, please? So if you need that, please see 10 Lisa. 11 Before we begin public testimony, we have a 12 few items of business to address. First, I would like 13 to call this meeting to order as of 10:00 a.m., and 14 recognize our Commissioners that are present or excused. MS. KAHUHU: Chair, Flo Wiger will be excused 15 16 today, and we hope to see Stephanie soon. 17 CHAIR STONE: Okay. Very good. Thank you. 18 Stephanie didn't say she wasn't coming, right? 19 MS. KAHUHU: No. 20 MEMBER DELEON: Stacy. 21 CHAIR STONE: Stacy. 22 MS. KAHUHU: Sorry. CHAIR STONE: It's all right. She goes by 23 24 both. 25 Also, I would like to present our staff today.

10/10/2011

```
1
        there was something about consideration of a 13-2. I
2
        just didn't know what -- I couldn't remember what that
3
        meant.
4
                   MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?
5
                   CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner DeLeon.
6
                   MEMBER DELEON: That refers to the Charter,
7
         Boards and Commissions, under 13-2, General provisions.
8
                   MEMBER OKAMOTO: So he was talking about the
9
        section?
10
                   MEMBER DELEON: Section in the Charter.
11
                   MEMBER OKAMOTO: Thank you. Thank you.
12
                   CHAIR STONE: Does that answer your question?
13
                   MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes, it does.
14
                   CHAIR STONE: Okay. Very good. Do I have a
15
        motion?
16
                   VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Move to approve.
17
                   CHAIR STONE: I have a motion to approve from
18
19
                   MEMBER DE REGO: Second.
20
                   MEMBER SUGIMURA: Second.
21
                   CHAIR STONE: I have a second. Very good.
22
        Any discussion -- any further discussion on this?
23
            (No Response.)
24
                   CHAIR STONE: All in favor of approving the
25
        minutes, please say "aye."
```

10/10/2011

(A chorus of ayes.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR STONE: Very good. The minutes are approved. I know, it's just 10:00.

We'll now move on to oral testimony. Before we begin, I would like to go over our oral testimony rules. We'll call up each public testifier in the order that they registered to testify. Each person will have five minutes to testify on all items in our agenda today. Following a testifier's testimony, I will ask Commissioners if they need clarification of the presented testimony.

Lisa, please introduce our first testifier. MS. KAHUHU: Thank you, Chair. First testifier is Mary Cochran.

CHAIR STONE: Hello, Mary. Thank you for being here.

...BEGIN PUBLIC TESTIMONY...

MS. COCHRAN: Good morning. Thank you, all of you, for the services you're doing for our County. It is -- after all, the Charter is our local constitution and does have far-reaching effects, politically, socially, economically. So I can imagine that it has not been easy, looking at the makeup of this panel. So thank you.

I only want to talk about two topics. One

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

very briefly. And I imagine that you guys have already discussed this at length, but just as a -- just to say

10/10/2011

what I feel about that, the proposed Charter amendment of district voting.

Now, I'm sure, with Judge Baxa over there, that you guys have been made aware of the legal precedence with respect to the principle of one man, one vote, as required by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and articulated by the Court in two cases, Reynolds v. Sims, and Avery v. Midland County. Which, by the way, yeah, we want to be like the mainland, we want to be like Avery v. Midland County where the court required one man, one vote and district-wide -- I mean, at-large voting. Now, to me, district voting under these two cases could not withstand legal challenge. And I can guarantee that if this panel decides they want to put it as a proposed Charter amendment, that -- and for some miracle, it should pass, you can almost guarantee there's going to be some legal challenge to this. And there is precedent

Now, the other reason that I want to talk about -- and I understand I've got more than three minutes, right?

to uphold not doing it.

CHAIR STONE: Five minutes.

10/10/2011

8

MS. COCHRAN: Okay. To me, we have four more amendments that need to be made. And I speak of establishing, number one, a County Auditor position similar to that of the position held by the Legislative Auditor Marion Higa for the State. Now, such a position would go beyond what currently exists within the power of the County of Managing Director or the different department heads to assess and evaluate our County systems.

Does it have to be a full-fledged department? Not necessarily so. But that the Council, or whomever you deem can make the appointment, can appoint from time to time, as need be, an independent auditor that assesses, that evaluates and recommend, if necessary, a repertoire of changes to make our County government far more efficient and far more responsive to the needs of our economic and social needs. I'll give you an example. The last time the Charter was amended, you have a Chapter 16, the Cost of Government Commissions. So -- so who oversees the overseer? And to me, an independent auditor on the same level as Marion Higa, who we all respect and admire, you know, should be at least seriously considered.

For example: If you want more transparency and more accountability for the monies that we are

10/10/2011

9

expending in the area of nonprofits -- I know that's a very sensitive area, but nevertheless, Maui County gives out \$30 million a year vis-a-vis Kauai which is about 7 million, Oahu which gives out about 20 million. So from all the counties, this county is the -- the greatest -the grand daddy of them all, as far as I'm concerned. So if you have an auditor that can either validate the necessity of continuing such funding, or propose the elimination or streamlining with a rational basis or some funding for those nonprofits that replicate services. And we know it does exist. Okay. So --

And then another thing, one final thing. I think I'm closing in on my five minutes. Now, too many amendments can be frustrating to the ordinary voter, especially in a year, next year, we will be electing a president in addition to new congressional representatives, in addition to our local elections. And people get frustrated. They ignore the amendments. They look at it and say, "My God, am I in California or what." So they see all these amendments. And, you know, the unfair part for those that want to see it pass, a blank vote is, what, counted as a no vote.

So be very judicious in amending our Charter. Because if something really -- especially with our changing times in Maui, we do have the County Council

ጸ

who was the authority to -- to resolution to add to our Charter. So be very judicious in that is all I'm saying, is just don't have too many because they'll choke the ordinary voter. I know it chokes me. So please prioritize our amendments.

And thank you very much for what you guys are doing. And know that this document carries the same weight as the Constitution of the United States and our State Constitution. Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Ms. Cochran. Hang on one second. Commissioners, any clarification on the testimony? Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Mary, I did not -- I didn't understand your first point. Are you saying that our current elective system would not withstand the test?

MS. COCHRAN: Well, if you -- no, our current system will withstand. It's been in place there for years. But this proposal to make district voting, an example, Paia, Makawao, Haiku, district voting, to me, says only those voters in that area can vote for their representative, and not this at-large thing that we have currently.

MEMBER DELEON: Okay.

MS. COCHRAN: To me, the current system is

legal. And, you know, it's been in place. So if

anybody wanted to challenge that, the challenge would have come a long time ago, to say, hey, this goes against the Fourteenth Amendment. But, no, the way it is right now, it falls squarely within the Fourteenth Amendment protection.

MEMBER DELEON: Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Any further clarifications? No. Thank you, Ms. Cochran, so much for being here.

MS. COCHRAN: Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Lisa, next testifier, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Fire Chief Jeff Murray.

CHAIR STONE: Fire Chief, thank you very much

for being here.

CHIEF MURRAY: Thank you. Good morning, Chair. Good morning, Members. I am here to answer any questions that you may have. There have been some testifiers, whether they're County employees or members of the community, that have made some statements about our department. And I'm here to answer any of your questions that you may have.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Clarification,
Commissioners? Any questions for the Fire Chief, since
we have him down here, on the testimony presented?
Commissioner Moikeha.

10/10/2011

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I don't know if it's something we're going to get to today as we go through the proposals, but, when we do, if we could have you come back at that point in time.

CHIEF MURRAY: Absolutely. That would be excellent.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay.

CHIEF MURRAY: Because I'd like to be able to answer some misleading things that were said.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. That, most likely, will happen. So when we get to that stage of the Active List, I have a feeling the Commissioners will request your presence.

CHIEF MURRAY: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: I do have Commissioner Hedani

here.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes, Chief. Do you have any comments on what's been submitted so far?

CHIEF MURRAY: Yes, I do, actually. If we can go to your active proposals, on -- starting at Page 4, Chapter 7.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Chair, can we have the date of that document that Mr. Murray is --

CHAIR STONE: It was the last -- in our last

, can we have the date ast -- in our last 10/10/2011

1;

CHIEF MURRAY: Yeah, I believe it was October

3rd.

CHAIR STONE: It starts off -- yeah

CHIEF MURRAY: And there was a typo on that one, that it says the year 2100, yeah. I was a little -- I woke up and said, "Woah, I need to retire."

(Laughter.)

MEMBER SUGIMURA: What page again?

CHIEF MURRAY: 4.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Page 4.

CHAIR STONE: Page 4, Chapter 7.

CHIEF MURRAY: Okay. On Item 8.7.1, and the

deletion of Section 8-7.2 and Subsection 8-7.3, it shouldn't -- shouldn't the degrees be specified for this type of position and not a generic degree, if that's what is being asked here? And, also, would there be time allowed for our personnel within our department to work towards that?

CHAIR STONE: Chief Murray, I don't mean to interrupt. I just -- as I recall, what we did when we came to this chapter -- or these -- these proposals was we just made a generic move all proposals to the Active List to discuss. So, basically, I think that -- correct me if I'm wrong, Commission, but I believe that we just moved all proposals to that Active List to discuss. So

25 packet handed out.

...

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

21 22

23

24

25

nothing -- that Active List includes every spectrum of what was proposed for Fire and Public Safety.

CHIEF MURRAY: All right. Thank you. I just didn't want to miss an opportunity to speak.

CHAIR STONE: Of course. Of course.

CHIEF MURRAY: On the 26th, I was off island,

so I was unable to be here to represent our department.

CHAIR STONE: I can see how you might be surprised when you opened the Active List. Okay. So that is the case. So when we get to this, I think it's -- that would be the appropriate time to really bring in the Chief, don't you think?

MEMBER DELEON: Yeah, that's what I was going to sav.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Rather than go through this

step right now --

CHAIR STONE: Right.

MEMBER DELEON: -- let's set a time and ask

him to come back at a particular time.

CHAIR STONE: Yeah. Let's see how we do today

on the Active List and then we'll be able to set that.

But we assure you, you'll be called, for sure.

CHIEF MURRAY: Appreciate it. Thank you very

much. Have a nice day.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Have a fantastic day.

Lisa, next testifier, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Thomas Croly.

CHAIR STONE: Mr. Croly, thank you for coming

today.

MR. CROLY: Aloha, Commission. My name is Thomas Croly, I'm testifying today on my own behalf.

Corrupt, a word that should have no place in government. Naive, perhaps, to believe that it doesn't. But nevertheless, something that we should always be vigilant in watching out for.

The word corrupt comes from Latin which means -- the Latin corruptus which means broken into pieces. Another definition is lacking integrity.

We must do everything possible to avoid allowing our elective system from becoming corrupt. Yet I would put forward that the system that we now have to elect our County Council is just that, it's a corrupt system. It's broken.

I know this may seem a bit extreme to hear, but as I look at the process that we've been using over the past 20 years here in Maui County, this is the conclusion that I've drawn. I say this because when I look at the choice the voters have been given in

10/10/2011

16

electing the representative from Molokai, for eight of the past nine elections, they haven't been given a choice. There's only been one choice on - on the ballot. That's a problem. In Lanai, that's been the case three out of the last nine elections.

I'm sorry. I lost my place here.

For the current elective system to be just and fair, I would expect that the public would have the choice of at least two candidates for election and that each of these candidates would have an equal chance to be heard by the folks that are going to elect them. That means, under our current system, throughout the entire County.

On our present system, it's not the case. For a candidate, with honest full-time residence on Molokai or Lanai to become heard by a majority of the voters, he or she would have to spend an extreme amount of time campaigning and engaging voters on the Island of Maui, since it's the voters from the Island of Maui who actually elect the representative from Lanai or Molokai. In fact, in most of the elections over the past 20 years, the folks in Lanai and Molokai did not, by their choice, elect the person who -- who became their representative.

There are more ways that our current system is

10/10/2011

17

also corrupt, but there's no need to even look into them because corrupt is corrupt, and we need to fix it. I understand the difficulty in meeting the equal representation requirement and balancing the unique needs of our County's islands in the elective process. But there's one thing for certain, the current system must be changed. It's broken into pieces.

The other thing is that the people should decide what that is. It shouldn't simply be decided here. It's the kuleana of this Charter Commission to put forward a choice for the voters to consider. Anything short of that would render this -- this Charter Commission to be corrupt.

I look forward to hearing this Commission have a spirited debate on the alternative effective systems for choosing -- for the choice to be put on the ballot for -- for the voters in 2012.

If I can mention one other issue that I brought up in previous testimony, that appears didn't make your cut. I just make a plea for it. And that is alternative commission members. For those commissions that have difficulty making quorum sometimes, or those commissions that are just so important that we need more than a bare quorum for them to do business, Planning Commission, the Cultural Resources Commission, the idea

5 6

7

1

2

3

13 14 15

16

12

21 22 23

of having alternative commission members, I think, would be a valid one.

Thank you

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much, Mr. Croly.

Commissioners, any clarification on the testimony?

Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Croly, when you speak to corruption in the system, are you talking about a structural problem, or as opposed to a people problem?

MR. CROLY: I think the -- first, let me make very clear, I'm not saying that any individual is corrupt. I don't want anyone to -- to, you know, misconstrue that I'm saying that -- that anyone who's been elected or that anyone in the system is corrupt. But the system itself is corrupted. I don't think that this system serves either the electorate or the candidate seeking office. It doesn't serve the candidate seeking office, as I already pointed out, because it's very, very difficult for a candidate to rise from an individual district and campaign island-wide. It's particularly more difficult for someone from Molokai or -- or Lanai to rise from being unknown and then campaign throughout -- throughout Maui. So this gives a huge advantage to the person who is the incumbent from either of these -- these places.

But it also doesn't serve the electorate because, every two years, the electorate has to go to the — to the polling place and they have to make an educated decision, perhaps about nine different councilmembers. Of course, it hasn't been nine different councilmembers because, in many cases, there hasn't been another opponent put up. But if the system was working as it should, that means they need to research and make an educated choice of 18 different folks.

And just as Mary Cochran pointed out, if we give the voters too many things to choose from, it becomes difficult for them to make the choice. I hope that we don't have 18 ballot initiatives from -- from this Charter Commission. Can you imagine, you know, people going into the polling place and having to have all that information? They're going to need a whole notebook in order to keep that. And the same is true of our councilmembers. People can deal with, I like this councilmember over that councilmember as my district representative. That, I think the electorate is ready to do. I'm not sure the electorate is ready to say, I live in Hana and I think the best choice for the guy in Molokai is so-and-so.

MEMBER DELEON: Thank you.

10/10/2011

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Mr. Croly, thank you very much for testifying. And I just wanted to make a general statement about your comments about Councilmember Mateo. As -- when we went to Molokai and heard from the Molokai community -- as you reference in your testimony that they were given the -- the community was giving -- given no choices because he ran unopposed, I think that the Island of Molokai said really loud and clear that they appreciated his work and so, therefore, they were satisfied that there was nobody else running against him. So maybe you think that, for the Island of Molokai, it looked unfair to not have another choice, but I think what we heard from the community -- and maybe Stacy can clarify -- is that they were happy with the services that he provided, so, therefore, there was nobody else running against him. So that was kind of the summary we heard from Island of Molokai.

MR. CROLY: If I could respond to that. I've never heard something so corrupt in my life. A small group of people said, we're satisfied with this guy, so there's no one else who should -- should necessarily put themselves forward. That, in and of itself, I think, makes my point. That's a corrupt system.

10/10/2011

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Thank you, Mr. Croly, for testifying on behalf of Maui County. You know, I'm sure you're speaking on behalf of all of us. I'm a little puzzled how you can speak on behalf of the people of Molokai. It wasn't a small group -- I just want to correct you on that -- that spoke on -- on behalf of protecting their opportunities to have representatives from their island. But my question, since you seem to have so much knowledge on the election, all of the districts on Maui, aren't they mostly incumbents, anyway?

MR. CROLY: Our -- our system does typically favor the incumbent. And it's usually the incumbent who is reelected. But I'm not speaking on behalf of the people of Molokai. And it doesn't matter how many numbers that is. The representative from Molokai is not elected by the folks of Molokai. The representative who lives in Molokai is elected by all of the people of Maui County.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Correct.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes.

MR. CROLY: And it's all of the people of Maui County who should have the choice. It's not just the people of Molokai who should say, this is our choice,

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

the folks in -- in -- on Maui Island shouldn't have a choice, we've made ours. That is corrupt, my friend --

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners, any further clarification? Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Thank you for your testimony. So are you now saying that everyone should be a part of the process of electing all candidates?

MR. CROLY: Under our current system, that is the case. Okay. What we need to look at is how is our current system working, how well is it working. We -we have 20 years of experience, we can look back on that now. Right now, the current system says every person in Maui County has the -- has the -- the say in who gets elected to the Council. There's alternate systems that -- that will be brought to you, and i'm sure you're aware of, district voting and so forth, where individual districts will only vote for an individual.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So let me clarify, so I understand. So you support that areas will be divided up by population, equal population, and that each area will vote for their own candidate as opposed to voting for the entire at-large?

MR. CROLY: Actually, I'm not testifying in support of any specific idea. Okay. I'd like this --

this Commission to bring forward ideas. And then, if the time is right, I might come back and say, I support this idea over that idea. But right now, what I'm supporting is that the Commission cannot ignore that our current system is not working and look at other systems and bring forward other choices for the voters to consider.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay. And I don't think we're ignoring it. It has been moved to discussion, a general discussion of district voting. And it will be part of our agenda item today, to have that open discussion. I think your perception of corruption is subjective. And if you --

MR. CROLY: Of course.

MEMBER DELEON: Chair, point of order. This is being argumentative. This is not a question.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Chair, I am not being argumentative.

CHAIR STONE: Hang on one second. Just -just let's continue and let's remember we have a lot of work to do today. So, obviously, we're not --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I believe, Chair, for the record, I stated a question and the question was answered. Did you receive a question from me, Mr. Crolv?

10/10/2011

24

MR. CROLY: I -- I received a question,

then --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: And you answered it.

CHAIR STONE: Order.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I appreciate it.

CHAIR STONE: Order. Please, order.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Guys, come on.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: May I continue, Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Order. Yes. My point being is

that this is to clarify testimony --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Exactly.

make statements.

question to clarify --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So then let's have a point of order, because I heard several statements from previous

20 Commissioners --

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Moikeha --

CHAIR STONE: -- do you have a question?

10/10/2011

25

MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- feels the need to interrupt me?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Why?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Chair, request a break.

CHAIR STONE: -- do you have a question?

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Recess.

MEMBER DE REGO: Recess.

CHAIR STONE: Recess? No.

Continue. Any more -- any further

clarification for the testifier? Commissioner.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: You mentioned that you think

the system is corrupt if there's only one person running for an office. I notice many times in the legislative realm there are -- all over Oahu, even sometimes here. there's only one person running. Would that system

then, in your mind, also be corrupt?

MR. CROLY: On occasion, there's going to be situations where there's only one choice. And -- and that's fine. Okay. But when -- eight out of the last nine elections, there was only one choice. To me, that says something. And I agree that my -- that it's subjective as far as the level that -- that one would say something is corrupt.

CHAIR STONE: - from the testifier, not to MEMBER MOIKEHA: Exactly. CHAIR STONE: So, please, if you have a

MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- and Mr. --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- DeLeon --

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Moikeha, please.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My evaluation -- and that's exactly what my testimony was -- is that I believe we have a corrupt or broken system when the result of it is that eight out of the nine last elections, there's only been one choice.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Thank you. CHAIR STONE: Further clarification? Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I would like to clarify what you had said earlier. And if you could submit to this body some documentation that shows that the process is corrupt. For me and my weighing of the -- of decision-making, I like to see some documented proof that maybe it isn't just your perception.

MR. CROLY: Okay.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So if you would be so kind to be able to submit that, that would help clarify even further for me.

My second question dealt with the alternatives for commissions. And I believe you weren't here at that time, but what we did is we put a general discussion under boards and commissions, because we do feel that that's something that has to have more conversation about. I personally don't support alternatives, but your testimony and your comment to bring forth helped me clarify the position that maybe the whole thing needs to

Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners, any further clarification?

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Croly, I appreciate all your comments today. As all of us know, we have all the freedom in this world to say what we want to say. And you have that freedom. I myself give you the right to say what you have said.

Let me just say -- ask you a question now. You said that the system is corrupt, and that the small people that gathered on Molokai and Lanai are not the voice of the people. We just -- you say that it's probably insignificant portion that we heard, is that correct?

MR. CROLY: What -- what I said was if the -a small group of people on -- or a large group of people on Molokai, whatever, are the -- are the ones who make the choice for the entire island of Maui County, that is corrupt.

MEMBER BAXA: Yeah. Let me just add this, though. The meetings on Lanai and Molokai were well publicized. The people of Lanai and Molokai were asked

10/10/2011

28

to come to the meetings to testify, to express their view. Because we went there to listen to them. We expected the people to be there. If they actually had concerns, I hope that they did, for the people that went there -- in fact, I can say for the record that among all the communities in the county of Maui, I would say that the number of people who attended the meetings on Molokai and Lanai were the most as compared to the other groups. So I would say that the representation that the people of Molokai and Lanai were the most representative because they had the most people.

I -- I would not have said anything, but to have heard the word "corrupt" here, to me, is a very serious matter. Integrity among us, between you and me, is the most important thing that an individual in this world can ever hope to have. (Inaudible) if this Commission is going to return the present system, then this Commission itself is corrupt. I hope that the day will not come when this body will be actually corrupt. I would rather that I am not a member of this Commission.

Let me just end, though, that to say that something is corrupt does not really mean that something is corrupt. It is the perception from the individual.

Thank you very much.

10/10/2011

29

1 MR. CROLY: We are in total agreement. 2 MEMBER BAXA: Thank you, sir. CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners, any 3 4 further clarification? 5 (No Response.) 6 CHAIR STONE: Mr. Croly, thank you for your 7 testimony. 8

Lisa, next testifier, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Sylvia Cabral.

CHAIR STONE: Ms. Cabral, thank you for being here today.

MS. CABRAL: Good morning. Sylvia Cabral, speaking on my own behalf.

I'm here to ask that you vote for the district voting and the term limits. And the most important thing that I think Mr. Croly was trying to say, actually, is it's just an expense, it's such an expense and waste of time that councilmembers that we know, it takes 'em a year to -- to meet their staff, to find out, you know, how to do the -- all these forms. And the term limit for four years would be a more efficient use

And I think maybe people don't run on Molokai and Lanai because of the cost and the expense of running every two years.

I don't want to vote for somebody on Molokai or Lanai. And I -- maybe I don't even -- I don't remember, but maybe I don't even do it. Because why would a person in Kula or Kihei have any idea or want to spend the time researching what a person on Molokai or Lanai needs?

So -- and as Mrs. -- Ms. Cochran said, the most important thing, where it's really going to -- you're really going to feel it is in 2012, when 74 seats are running for Congress, representative, council, president, everybody's going to be running. Who is going to be running the government? They're all going to be campaigning, they're all spending billions and millions and thousands and hundreds of dollars. And it's just a more efficient use of our time and our money.

Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much.

Commissioners, any clarification on the testimony?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Thank you so much for being

here.

Lisa, next testifier, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Roy Vandoom.

CHAIR STONE: Mr. Vandoorn, thanks for being

here.

MR. VANDOORN: Good morning. My name is Roy Vandoom. And I currently live in the city of Wailuku.

Thank you for the opportunity to address this Commission this morning. I'm here, also, to discuss and provide input on district voting and councilmembers' term limits.

Relative to district voting, let's just imagine for a second we could have a completely blank slate, and I was here this morning testifying in front of you. And I provided a scheme where you had a group A that had 3,000 people in it and we gave them a representative, then we had group B with 7,000 people and we gave them a representative, and we had group C with 28,000 people, and we gave them a representative. One of you, when you're having the discussion, would clearly bring up the question of equal representation. And the reason for that is, is that there is a group of 10,000 people that would have two votes on the Council and a group of 28,000 people who would only have one vote on the Council. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, that's what we have today. That's exactly the situation that we have today.

So regardless of if you believe – if equal representation or not equal representation is acceptable

10/10/2011

or unacceptable, I respectively request that you put it on the ballot and let the people of Maui County decide if equal representation is a way that they would like to see their County Council structured.

Furthermore, please include that people only vote for the person that's going to be representing them. For me personally, I live in Wailuku, I don't think I should have input on who represents Makawao. That's a Makawao decision.

On the second issue of councilmember terms, I'm in support of increasing the term limits to four years, and limiting people to two-year terms. In other words, a councilperson could only serve for total of eight years, irregardless if they are consecutive terms or nonconsecutive terms.

I believe the combination of district voting and only -- and term limits will allow people to run for public office. Because, right now, with all due respect to our council people, you see them having lots of fund-raisers where they have to get the funds so they can campaign across the entire county and across all of the islands. If we have district voting and limited terms, the cost of running for office would be reduced, and it would open the opportunity to many more people, giving them an opportunity to run and, hopefully, serve

10/10/2011

on our Council.

Thank you again for allowing me to address your Commission.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much.

Commissioners, clarification? Commissioner

Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Good morning.

MR. VANDOORN: Good morning.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Thank you for testifying.

Are you of the opinion that our Council representation,
our nine Council represents only their districts, or do

MR. VANDOORN: Yeah.

they represent all of Maui County --

MEMBER CRIVELLO: -- in making decisions?

MR. VANDOORN: It depends on the issue, right.

Because when there is a proposal in front of the Council, they all vote on the proposal. However, I have heard anecdotally that a councilperson from one district was attempting to influence something in another district, and they got their hand slapped. So do they represent the entire -- do they represent the entire county in all issues? No.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: That's of your opinion?

MR. VANDOORN: That is my opinion.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Right. May I ask another

•

10/10/2011

1

1 question? 2 CHAIR STONE: Yes, please. MEMBER CRIVELLO: So, in your opinion or with 3 your knowledge, should ordinance pass for the 3,000 or 4 7,000 population of Molokai and Lanai, when the meter 5 6 rates go up to \$6,000 because of meeting the cost of development on Maui, is Molokai and Lanai exempt? If 7 the water rates go up, is Molokai and Lanai exempt, in 8 9 your opinion? 10 MR. VANDOORN: Well, I'm not sure we want to 11 get into a whole water discussion here. MEMBER CRIVELLO: No. I'm just trying to --12 13 trying to see --14 MR. VANDOORN: Yeah. 15 MEMBER CRIVELLO: -- if just because we have 16 3,000 population on Lanai, or 7,000, 8,000 population on 17 Molokai, when laws and ordinances are passed by the nine 18 councilmembers --19 MR. VANDOORN: Uh-huh. MEMBER CRIVELLO: -- are the people of Lanai 20 and Molokai exempt or are we obliged by the laws that 21 22 are put forth for all of Maui County? 23 MR. VANDOORN: Maui County laws need to be 24 implemented equally across the entire county. MEMBER CRIVELLO: Okay. 25

2 need to have equal representation with the people making 3 those decisions. 4 MEMBER CRIVELLO: Thank you. CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners, 5 6 further clarification? 7 MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair? 8 CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa. MEMBER BAXA: Sir, can I just ask one 9 10 question? You mention about a councilman who tried to 11 introduce legislation that pertained to the district of 12 a certain councilmember, is that correct? MR. VANDOORN: I did not say legislation. It 13 14 was my understanding that they were trying to help with 15 a community concern, and they were informed that that 16 actually needed to be done by the person representing 17 that area. 18 MEMBER BAXA: I see. Yeah. Well, I stand 19 corrected. 20 MR. VANDOORN: I apologize, sir, if I confused 21 VOU. 22 MEMBER BAXA: It could extend to legislation, 23 though, also? 24 MR. VANDOORN: I'm not -- the question you're 25 -- what's the question you're asking, please?

MR. VANDOORN: And all of those individuals

10/10/2011

of another councilman?

Right. So we have --

in on the position that you have, that --

elected only within your own district.

MR. VANDOORN: Right.

MR. VANDOORN: Right.

I think from the Commissioner from Molokai, that is it

your position that a councilman should only be

36

3 4 5

1

2

6 7 8

9 10 11

12 13

18 19 20

21 22

23 24 25

interested in the interests of his own district. And I think you answered the question. MR. VANDOORN: So let me give you a tangible example. Okay. Central Maui today has a huge problem with non-dedicated roads. Right? Right now, I believe that when that issue comes up, correcting that issue for Central Maui should be the Central Maui representative's -- councilperson's responsibility. I don't think that I should be going, knocking on the councilmember from Upcountry to say, please help me

MEMBER BAXA: If I understand your position,

MR. VANDOORN: It depends on the issue.

MEMBER BAXA: But -- no. I am trying to zero

MEMBER BAXA: Because the one councilman to be

MEMBER BAXA: So a question was posed to you,

it is that a councilman should not really be interested

internally within what is happening within the district

10/10/2011

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

37

1 create -- get the roads dedicated in Central Maui. And 2 if the people of Central Maui are allowed to vote for 3 that individual, then those specific issues that are 4 important to Central Maui can be -- make sure they 5 become part of the campaign rather than making the 6 campaign a purely generic Maui County issue, which it is 7 today because they have to appeal to all voters. 8 CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners, 9

MEMBER BAXA: Let me just follow up,

Mr. Chair.

please?

whose councilman would be to attend to that?

Makawao, you would expect the Makawao representative to spearhead that for the Council.

Makawao that affects the whole county. MR. VANDOORN: I'm -- could you give me an

example, please?

further clarification? CHAIR STONE: Sure, Mr. Baxa. MEMBER BAXA: Supposing there's something that happens in Makawao that affects the whole county. MR. VANDOORN: Could you give me an example, MEMBER BAXA: Whose jurisdiction would be --MR. VANDOORN: If there's a issue that affects MEMBER BAXA: Something that happens in

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MEMBER BAXA: Let's us say water.

MR. VANDOORN: Water. We have a county-wide water system that is headed up by a water director who puts together a Maui-wide plan. That Maui-wide plan is agreed to by the Council and the Mayor. And as such, that is a -- when you do trade-offs between that, that is a county-wide decision, which is voted on by those -by all the councilmembers.

MEMBER BAXA: Okay.

CHAIR STONE: Does that answer your question, Commissioner Baxa?

MEMBER BAXA: So the initiative could come from any particular councilman irrespective of the district they represent?

MR. VANDOORN: If it's a county-wide resource, absolutely.

MEMBER BAXA: So do you admit, then, that there is also some advantage to the county-wide system as contrasted to the districts -- or the district system that you're proposing?

MR. VANDOORN: I think you have a choice point. I think you have a very interesting choice point. You either have county-wide council or you have districts. Okay. Based upon what I'm hearing from this Commission, a county-wide system, where there are --

where people are not attached to a district, but we have nine members that run at-large, that aren't related to any, is a perfectly acceptable solution, but I don't think it meets the needs of what I'm hearing. People want to know who their councilperson is. They would like to be able to go to talk to someone.

MEMBER BAXA: Okay. I think you have clarified your position. Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much. Commissioners. And just a point of order, please, no debating with our testifiers. They're here just to give their testimony and we're meant to clarify. No debates, please.

Thank you very much, Mr. Vandoorn.

Lisa, next testifier please.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair, I would like to make a -- can I say something?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: I'd like to make a comment as to what you say, debating. You know, we are trying to clarify things here. Debate is a form of clarification. So please let us be careful about the words we say. Thank you.

> CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner Baxa. Next testifier, please, Lisa.

10/10/2011

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. KAHUHU: Victoria Cheromcka.

40

CHAIR STONE: Hello, Victoria. Thank you for

being here.

MS. CHEROMCKA: Aloha, Chair and Commissioners. My name's Victoria Cheromcka. And I've lived on Maui since 1988.

To begin, I'd like to thank you all for your service. This is an extremely important and time-consuming thing you are undertaking for the County of Maui. And I very much appreciate your efforts and contribution.

I testified several weeks ago, asking you to give the voters of Maui the chance to decide on district voting and four-year terms for councilmembers. I'm back again to ask one time -- one more time for this opportunity.

I support the constitutional concept of one person, one vote. Maui's current electoral system does not provide this. It heavily skews the voting power of less than 10 percent of the population. At the same time, lessening the voting power of 90 percent. This is

As -- as for four-year terms for Council, the opportunity for increased productivity and efficiency

10/10/2011

41

the new ropes year one and campaigning year two. That's a lot of pressure as well as energy for nonproductive duties. I would not enjoy doing my job under these conditions. I believe this would result in a wider selection of candidates who would be more willing to undertake that tough job.

I'm asking you to please let the voters decide, include district voting and four-year terms on the 2012 ballot. Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much.

Commissioners, clarification?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Thank you, Victoria, for being here today. Appreciate it.

Lisa, next testifier, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Peter Davis.

CHAIR STONE: Mr. Davis, thank you for being

here.

MR. DAVIS: Good morning. My name is Peter Davis and I'm a resident of South Kihei. I've been on the island for about less than 10 years, but I've witnessed several election cycles. And it has been fascinating. It's been difficult to understand.

I've lived in jurisdictions before that have -- have large voting. And I've lived in jurisdictions

will be huge. Let's end the two-year cycle of learning

that have representative district voting. I've never seen or lived in an environment where we have the fiction of both at the same time. And that's what I think we're confronted with here is clearly a fiction of both systems.

We have someone who is supposed to represent a district, but when resoundedly defeated by the voters of that district, they get swept into office by the voters at-large. I don't understand how this can be perpetuated. I think it's abundantly clear that it would be the best thing for you to do to give the voters a chance to change that system.

On the subject of term limits, I've witnessed people who have gone into office and served the full 10-year term, sat out for two, go back to 10 more, sat out for two. This is not meaningful term limits. There should be a maximum term served. This should not be a career job. You're here in a public service capacity when you're serving as a councilmember. It's not supposed to be a lifetime job. And I would ask you to address that and put that on the ballot, also.

And those are my comments. I'm well within my five minutes.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much. We appreciate that.

Commissioners, any clarification on the testimony?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much, Mr. Davis.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIR STONE: Lisa, next testifier, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Bob Lightbourn.

CHAIR STONE: Mr. Lightbourn, thank you for

coming.

MR. LIGHTBOURN: Thank you for letting me -giving me the opportunity. I know that you folks have
put a lot of time into this Commission. I can't
imagine.

Anyway, my name is Bob Lightbourn. And my eyes are getting old, so I'm going to put on my glasses.

And I'm the president of the Realtors Association of Maui, speaking on behalf of our association.

The Realtors Association of Maui wishes to go on record in support of this Commission placing the reform of Maui County Council elective process before the voters. Our association believes that there has been enough community debate on the issue, there are clear and compelling arguments on both sides of the issue, now the voters need the opportunity to decide for themselves.

10/10/2011

Our association carefully considered this question before deciding to support instituting a single-member equally-proportioned elective system to replace the at-large system we currently have. We simply believe that it is wrong to have a system that so overrepresents some areas and greatly underrepresents others. It is wrong to have a system that results in councilmembers getting elected election after election without any competition. It is wrong that candidates are elected despite the opposition of the community in which they are supposed to represent.

The question was raised as to why this is a realtor issue. It was decided that, considering all of the reforms or adjustments we could advocate, none can be more significant and more important than reforming the odd way we elect our County Council. Our members watched the Sol Kaho`ohalahala case with amazement. And for many of us, it put a spotlight on how out of whack our County Council system is. The more we reviewed it, the more we decided it was our duty as citizens to express our position.

We believe that this is a question -- that this question be placed -- I'm sorry. We ask this question be placed on the ballot to allow the voters to choose what kind of system they want to select their

10/10/2011

representatives.

Our association would also like to support a proposal to change the Council's term of office to four-year terms. We would also support a proposal that would restrict the County Council Members' number of terms to a maximum of two. We believe that these should not be career positions, and, after eight years of service, our system should allow someone else to step forward.

That's within five minutes, I think. Mahalo for this opportunity to present our position.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Mr. Lightbourn.

Commissioners, clarification on the testimony?

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Thank you for your testimony, for being here today. Just for clarification, when you said that you represent RAM, how does that go out to your membership? Was it in discussion amongst the members, did they get to vote either way?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: It was a number of discussions among our members. This wasn't something that we entered into lightly. And, again, we have a large membership, and there's a number of varied opinions on it. So, basically, what we're saying is we'd just like to see it put before a vote for the

MEMBER MOIKEHA: And I can appreciate that. I am a member of RAM as a licensed realtor of the State of Hawaii.

MR. LIGHTBOURN: Uh-huh.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I don't recall anything specifically coming to me asking for my opinion or taking a vote as a whole membership. And that's why I asked for clarification. Did something go out to the members to vote their opinions --

MR. LIGHTBOURN: No.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- or a survey?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: There was not a survey that went out.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So there was no vote?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: No.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Was there any survey done of

the membership?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: Not -- well, the members that were involved, yes. If you're not a member, if you're not involved in RAM, then you probably didn't know about it

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay. I understand.

MR. LIGHTBOURN: We have 1,400 members, and a

lot of them don't really get involved in the actual

10/10/2011

leadership of any part of RAM, or, for that matter, the County as a whole. It's fairly representative of the population of Maui. There are those who are more active in everything.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So -- so I understand, of this 1,400 membership, there was no survey done specifically out to every member, whether they're involved or not, they're still a member, and there was no casting of a vote of a decision specific of a model of what RAM would like to see proposed --

MR. LIGHTBOURN: No. We're not -MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- for district voting?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: We're not proposing any particular model. We're proposing that it be put forward for a vote.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay. And the same thing with the term, four years, was there any survey done with that?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: It was part of the joint – joint discussion. And – and our – the general feeling from the members that we did hear from was along the same lines of it's pretty difficult to do a job in two years when, like you say, you spend the first year learning the job, the next year you spend campaigning to get elected. We feel that it would be more beneficial

10/10/2011

to our councilmembers, to get the job done, that they put their time forward to do if they had more time to learn. I mean, as president of the association, it took me at least a year to even figure out what my job was.

And I am — nothing compared to what the County Council Members have to —

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So would you -- just to clarify, would you say that a lot of the discussion went on in the Government Affairs Committee and these debates and discussions amongst those members, which is a small group of RAM?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: The group is representative of – like, for instance, aside from my position as president, I take what I do in these committees back to my office. My office is one of the largest offices on the island, so I get the feedback from the people in my company. And the other members of the GAC. And the GAC Committee is open to anybody that wants to come in. The agenda for what the GAC's going to talk about is open to anybody that wants to read it and wants to show up and give us their opinions.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah. And I appreciate that.

Mr. DeLeon oversees that as an employee of RAM, does
send those out to -- and I'm on that list. So I
appreciate the overall input that they -- that RAM does

10/10/2011

bring forth to the community of, at least, realtors.

And that's why I'm just trying to clarify, was there any formal surveys done, but apparently not. Thank you very much.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioners? Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Well, as you know, I'm,

obviously --

MR. LIGHTBOURN: I know.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: -- also a member of RAM. And I would consider myself fairly active in RAM. I was shocked when I came -- when I first got the note or the letter saying that this was a position of the Realtors Association. This was probably a year or so ago.

MR. LIGHTBOURN: Uh-huh.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: And at the time I discussed with a few people, I believe, who were board, I think it came through the board. And, again, it was that, "Well, this is really better for Lanai and Molokai." And I was like, "What?" But my problem was, it seemed to have come from the board. The board does not have any representatives that includes Lanai. If you'll notice, you have — and I shouldn't be arguing. I have a question.

CHAIR STONE: That's fine.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Right.

MR. LIGHTBOURN: But they are, in theory, also general meetings for Upcountry, South Maui, West Maui, and a chance for the members to get with their directors and give them input on what they think or don't think.

Again, it's all based on the participation in RAM, like any other -- any other group. There are people that are more active than others.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Well, like I say, I think I'm fairly active. I've been to quite a few different caravans. I've never heard anybody discuss issues. But my biggest one, I guess, is like Susan, I just wondered that an organization came out supporting, and now you are saying the organization supports, but how many people would you base that on? Was this --

MR. LIGHTBOURN: I really don't know.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: - just your board? No. I'm just -- who made the decision to say, as an organization, was it just your board or was it the GAC?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: The Governmental Affairs

Committee discussed it, then we put it out for discussion to the Board of Directors. And the Board of Directors put it out to any of their members that happened to want to have input.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: And how many are on your

10/10/2011

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

52

board?

MR. LIGHTBOURN: 12?

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Thank you.

MR. LIGHTBOURN: Plus all the committee

members.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Further

clarification, Commissioners?

people going to see properties.

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Thank you, Mr. Lightbourn,

for being here. Appreciate it.

Lisa, next testifier, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Steve Parker.

CHAIR STONE: Mr. Parker, thank you for being

here.

MR. PARKER: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Board Members. I'm here just as a resident of Maui, not any organization, although I also belong to RAM. I am for the one man, one vote proposal be put on the -- on the ballot. District voting is what I think is the fairest. The problem is the unique nature of Hana, Lanai and Molokai, and how they should be represented. It's -- it's hard to put the two together since the

populations don't match with the voting power that they

have on the -- on the Council.

10/10/2011

53

A thought out there may be to give the -- the member being voted from any one of those districts a lesser voting power directed strictly by the amount of population in his district versus what every other population has. I.e. the Lanai vote might be a third of a vote and the -- and the Molokai vote might be half of a vote. I know that's probably a violation of something.

(Laughter.)

MR. PARKER: But, to me, you need to have somebody from those districts. I think it's important because the districts are very unique. So we -- you know, obviously, that's been the problem that we -- we face and that's where we are today. Just it's hard to - to balance the two. And then the -- the least of all evils was to have -- have them voted at-large. But, again, I think what happens is that some districts keep electing the same person because they have name recognition on the island. And it's hard to -- to come in and -- and challenge from those districts once you have island-wide name recognition.

So I am in favor of the one man, one vote and the district -- the district voting. I'm also in favor of term limits, the four-year term, because I think that's just more efficient. Thank you very much.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR STONE: Thank you for your testimony. 1 2 Commissioners, clarification on the testimony? 3 (No Response.) 4 CHAIR STONE: No. Thank you very much, 5 Mr. Parker, for being here. 6 MR. PARKER: Thank you. CHAIR STONE: Lisa, just a quick check, how 7 8 many more registered testifiers do we have? 9 MS. KAHUHU: That was our last one. 10 CHAIR STONE: Before I go to recess or close 11 oral testimony, I would like to say, anybody in the 12 public who has not testified, you're welcome to come 13 forward at this time to testify. Please. I just want to point out, after your testimony, make sure you 14 15 register with Lisa. 16 MS. OSHER: Okay. 17 CHAIR STONE: State your name, please. 18 MS. OSHER: My name is Wendy Osher. I'm 19 coming on behalf of the Fire Commission. I'm the 20 Vice-Chair of the commission. There was a proposal that had surfaced 21 22 recently regarding the chief's selection, that it be 23 placed in the hands of the Mayor. Currently, it's the 24 duty of the commission to hire or -- and/or fire the 25 chief. That's what our basic role is. And I think that

leaving it in the hands of the commission is a good

We have a diverse group of nine members that represent the different areas of the community. And we've developed a process that is solid over the years. We take into consideration the opinions of key department heads as well as evaluate candidates based on their qualifications. And we also do this in coordination with DPS. So I think that it takes away -it will take away the impartiality of the process if we leave it in the hands of the Mayor.

And that's all I have to say.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Wendy. Boy, that voice sure does sound familiar.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STONE: We appreciate you being here. Commissioners, clarification on that

testimony? Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: It just slipped right out of my brain.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Anyway, it's Frank's birthday, anyway. So, Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I thought it was his birthday.

CHAIR STONE: We'll come back to you, Dave.

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

56

MEMBER DELEON: Dynamic duo. MEMBER DE REGO: Wendy, thank you very much

for your testimony. I just have one question. When the chief is evaluated, what sort of public documentation or report is made that is available to the County as a whole on that evaluation?

MS. OSHER: When the chief is evaluated, we -we always -- during any of our meetings, we have a section for public testimony, just as you do here. So the public is always open to give their opinions. Are you talking about on the distribution of the evaluation?

MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. When the final report comes through on the evaluation of the chief, is that a public document or is it --

MS. OSHER: No.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- considered a civil service

thing and it's actually a personnel issue --

MS. OSHER: It's a personnel --

MEMBER DE REGO: -- where the --

MS. OSHER: Sorry. It's a personnel issue.

So we do provide an evaluation or a recap to the Mayor's Office and his -- I'm not sure if the department heads, but I know the Mayor gets a copy. It's not distributed to the public. We have the option of providing a press release to give like an overview of if he was -- he

10/10/2011

57

received a satisfactory evaluation or not. That's at the discretion of the commission.

MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. So not putting words in your mouth, but the information that goes out from the commission is very limited in terms of what the public is able to see in terms of the terms of the evaluation and what were the results of it?

MS. OSHER: Yeah, it's a personnel issue.

Yeah.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner

Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Thank you for your testimony. And if you could clarify for me, is there a set criteria that you -- where do you get what you set the criteria for? Where does that come from?

MS. OSHER: It was developed over the years. We do have an outline of qualifications that the County requires chief to obtain. There's a period where you put it out to the -- like you do a public notice where you advertise it in, I think, the two major newspapers. And then -- I'm sorry. What was the question again?

MEMBER MOIKEHA: A more specific -- more specifically concerned in clarification of the criteria. So maybe experience, length of education, residency. Do you follow some kind of national standard? Because I

know now the commission is going through their
accreditation. Do you adopt those standards? I guess
you will eventually, if they do become accredited.

MS. OSHER: Right. Right now -MEMBER MOIKEHA: What are you using now, where

does it come from?

MS. OSHER: Right now, it's outlined by the

County Department of -- or the DPS department. We are
able to reevaluate and take other things into
consideration. If the public feels that, oh, the

consideration. If the public feels that, oh, the residency requirement isn't what they want as a County, we can put that -- we can take that up as a commission and review that.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So would that be the same standards the Mayor might use to select?

MS. OSHER: Yes.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So it's similar or same?

MS. OSHER: I would think it was the same.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER DE REGO: Can I have one more

clarification?

CHAIR STONE: Sure, Frank. It's your birthday. Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: Is that criteria that is used

by DPS made public? Not -- not the report of the

final --

MS. OSHER: Right.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- but is that available for the public to see what standards or criteria are available to evaluate the chief?

MS. OSHER: I think it is a public document. When we put the ad out in the paper for the -- to call on the people who want to apply, it's listed there what the qualifications are in order to apply for the position.

MEMBER DE REGO: No. I'm talking about the yearly evaluation of the chief that's mandated by the Charter. There's a yearly evaluation that's mandated by the Charter. As we've heard, that is a civil service or personnel matter --

MS. OSHER: Right.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- when the final report comes out, but I'm just following up on Commissioner Moikeha's question, in terms of the criteria. Is the criteria by which the chief is evaluated made public? In other words, is it posted somewhere on a website or -- you know, I mean, it's not the final report, but it is -- the public at least would know that this is the criteria that the chief is being evaluated on when these public meetings are happening or when the testimony

10/10/2011

comes in. So I'm just wondering what the process is that sort of -- you know, openness and transparency is my issue here in terms of bringing the public into the process whenever these things occur.

MS. OSHER: You know, I don't think that the actual document that we have is made available to the public on the criteria for the evaluation; however, if any member of the public did want — did have a question on how we evaluate the chief, it's not — we're not hiding anything. So if they wanted to know, I'm sure any of the members would be willing to share — to share what that is.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: I finally remembered.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER DELEON: For your information, by the way, Wendy, the chief was here earlier, and we asked him to come back when we do the Fire Commission, Fire Commission related issues.

MS. OSHER: Oh, okay.

MEMBER DELEON: So he's going to be coming back later. So you might want to coordinate with him as well.

MS. OSHER: Okay.

MEMBER DELEON: The question I have is the

10/10/2011

commission's and department's relationship to the Mayor.

Right now, we're watching the Mayor in kind of like a contest with the chief over what to do with Ocean Safety officers.

MS. OSHER: Right.

MEMBER DELEON: Also, we have the Mayor proposing fire reserves, when the chief is not very happy about the whole concept. I'm wondering what your opinion of the relationship between the Mayor and the department and the commission is? Who really runs that department, the commission or --

MS. OSHER: The Fire Chief.

MEMBER DELEON: The Fire Chief does, okay.

Okay. And you oversee the Fire Chief. But where does the Mayor come into this question?

MS. OSHER: I think, just as anyone, he has -he has his opinions and his -- what do you call, his
objectives for the Administration. And I think that's
taken into consideration. Where the commission comes
into play, we're -- we oversee -- or we -- we have the
role of selecting -- hiring or firing a chief, which
means that we have to evaluate the chief based on his
performance of the overall department. The Mayor has
his opinions. And I think if the Mayor were to -- were
to select the chief, his -- his goals or his objectives

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

may unfairly influence how the department is run. Just as if the union were to select the chief, I think the same thing would happen. If you leave it in the hands of the commission, you have a diverse body of individuals who are selected over a period of time, with staggered terms, and that takes away the -- maybe any bias that there might be from anyone in Administration.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Follow-up. There is another proposal on the table besides the one just to take away the commission. And that is that the commission does the recruitment, does the vetting, does the nomination of the chief, but the final approval goes to the Mayor.

MS. OSHER: Exactly.

MEMBER DELEON: And then the final -- the Mayor's ability to remove is only to request from the commission, and the commission has to confirm that, taking politics out of -- out of the game. But, also, giving -- right now, the way I see it, the Mayor doesn't seem to have -- there's -- there's no necessarily loyalty from the Fire Chief to the Mayor. And I don't understand structurally why that is necessary, to have that separation. What is your feeling on that proposal?

-- the commission serves a very important role. It

today. Could you give me the news, please?

CHAIR STONE: Wendy, I didn't read the news

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you very much,

CHAIR STONE: Again, I put out the offer to

MR. FAULKNER: Bruce Faulkner. I'm here on my

MS. OSHER: It's partly sunny outside.

MS. OSHER: Appreciate your help.

you're welcome to come forward. Thank you, please state

the public. If anybody has not testified yet, please,

MS. OSHER: I'm against it. I think that the

10/10/2011

(No Response.)

(Laughter.)

(Laughter.)

Wendy, for being here.

vour name.

own behalf.

64

3

2

8 9 10

12 13 14

11

15 16 17

18 19 20

25

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Mr. Faulkner. MR. FAULKNER: I didn't come prepared to testify per se, but sitting here, listening to everybody, I thought I should speak my word here. So I guess I'm a little bit confused with the district voting or voting at-large because it seems to me that if we're supporting a at-large voting system, why not at least put it on the ballot and let the people decide, you know. With regard to term limits, I think there

gives the community a chance to have input in the process and have their opinions heard on issues of public safety. And I think taking that away is probably

MEMBER DELEON: Well, I'm not -- nobody --CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon, remember, no debating, please. No debating.

MEMBER DELEON: Okay. But I'm just trying to -- to make sure we have an understanding here.

MS. OSHER: Right.

MEMBER DELEON: The concept is you do everything you do now, you just are not the final decision. The final decision is the Mayor. You do all the selection, you have all the public input, you have all the other activities you do now.

MS. OSHER: Uh-huh.

MEMBER DELEON: It's just that the final say, the final approval is the Mayor.

MS. OSHER: The final approval is the Mayor, but we serve as the -- kind of to open up the process to both the public and keep it impartial. That's where our capacity lies.

> MEMBER DELEON: Okay. Okay. Thank you. CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners,

further clarification?

10/10/2011

65

should be no more than 10 years. And, personally, I'm for the two-year term versus the four-year. CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners, any clarification on the testimony? (No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Thanks so much for stepping forward.

Last chance, public, if anybody wants to come forward. We have emergencies going on here with our Commissioners.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: We need a break. CHAIR STONE: Okay. Nobody coming forward, thank you, at this time, without objection, I will close public testimony.

...END PUBLIC TESTIMONY...

CHAIR STONE: And we're going to take a short recess, 10 minutes, to give everybody a break. And we'll see everybody back here at 11:25. Thank you very much.

(Recess, 11:12 a.m. to 11:25 a.m.)

CHAIR STONE: I would like to call this meeting back to order at 11:25. At this time, without objection, the Chair will also accept and file all public communications for the record. You guys got that packet. There were some, also, additional

10/10/2011

communications put on our desk. Which there is one from Mr. Smith, Jim Smith, as well as something from Commissioner DeLeon, which pertains to something down the -- down the road on our agenda.

Okay. Moving on. Again, just to remind the Commissioners, we will have communication -- discussion on communication items down towards the end of the agenda.

So next item of business, Proposed Charter
Amendments Matrix. In our last packet, we have a letter
from our Commission Analysts, Sherry Broder and Jon Van
Dyke, dated October 3rd, 2011. And on -- in that
letter, topics were -- certain questions from our
Commissioners at the last meeting were answered. Let me
give you a guys a second to find that. It's in the
packet.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Is the bottom of it 1-6 that

we're looking at?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, 1-6. Very good. Thank

you. So, yes, Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: I have a question. I see

the letter and I read it.

CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: And thank you for spending the time answering our constitutional questions. So on the residency requirement --

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Sugimura, the microphone, please.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: On the -- so, Sherry, on the residency requirement section, can you put it in layman's term?

MS. BRODER: Okay. Read the first paragraph. I tried to summarize it. Okay. So, yes, you can have residency requirements. Courts have upheld it. And in particular, the Federal District Court here in Hawaii has upheld residency requirements for state office. But you have to still be reasonable. So it has to be a reasonable amount of time, you know.

So, for instance, in writing this -- I didn't give you a report on this opinion, but there was an opinion by the U.S. attorney to the Virgin Islands, and they wanted to put a 10-year residency on running for any office. And in that -- sorry -- in that opinion, which is very recent, they cited the Federal District Court of Hawaii's opinion and approvingly. So I think that that's still good law. And -- but they did point out that maybe 10 years would be found to be too long and unreasonable. But I think there's a lot of

10/10/2011

flexibility.

And I listed for you in that part of the opinion, starting on Page 2, all the different requirements in the different counties. So each county has different requirements. And then I also included the requirements for running for State House and State Senate and for Governor and Lieutenant Governor. So that, I thought, would give you the range of possibilities.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: To follow up on that question, residency, as defined -- I mean, that seemed to be the problem in Hawaii -- what does it mean, residency? Physically residing, intent to reside? Has that been clarified in any of the previous -- or in other counties?

MS. BRODER: Yeah, it has to be physical residency. I mean, you have to reside to have it be residency.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: But that has not been the case in Maui?

MS. BRODER: Well, there is a case that did go to the Hawaii Supreme Court, and they found that the person wasn't qualified because they weren't in fact

10/10/2011

residing on that island. I believe it was Lanai. So I think that issue has been clarified.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: So that would be the latest of the rulings?

MS. BRODER: Yes.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

Any further discussion on the letter?

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Thank you for that, because it really started to make me think about other things that are connected to this. If you could -- and I'll just put it in as a request -- and what triggered this for me was the paragraph on Page 3 where it talks about - and this was founded in an actual court case -- where the residency -- or the court found the committee report persuasive. And it says: "The residency requirements, too, are important; all states include such provisions in their constitutions. The role of the legislator is to represent the views of his constituents, and he must be familiar with them and their needs." And that made me stop and think because what impact or affect does this have on where we are today, at-large voting, where we require -- because of the at-large voting, such as, example, Molokai or Lanai, we require a resident to live

on island. And so now this court says how important that is, that this -- that these representatives -- views of his constituents and he must -- or she, must be familiar with them and their needs, and then the importance of living right there in that area. So where I'm going with this is would there be any legal constitution -- any challenge if we were to have a proposed amendment that changed that through different districting, where you have these islands absorbed into Maui?

MS. BRODER: I can give you a short answer right now, which is that, in reviewing -- in reviewing the three-year residency requirement, the court was looking for a justification for why. And so that is a justification supporting it. I don't think that -- that it can then be reinterpreted to say that that's a requirement. It's more an acceptable reason. However, obviously, this is going to be a matter of, you know, dispute. And, you know, I can do further research. You're sort of asking a different question now.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah, based on -- but you've already explained that it was a justification of this issue alone. I would appreciate, if there is time, to explore that further. Because we did have a testifier,

Ms. Cochran, who raised that issue, that it could be

challenged. And if what system we have today, at-large, has not been challenged yet -- because I've heard people also say what we're doing now is illegal. And so, you know, it's -- it's both of that. So if you could provide us some insight into that, I would appreciate

Thank you.

MS. BRODER: Okay.

CHAIR STONE: Good. Further discussion on the letter? Not including the new proposals, because that's further down on our agenda.

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Okay. Great.

So if you guys will notice, a full copy of the Matrix was provided in your packet, which we have already gone through, except for proposals that are in this letter. So that was done so you guys could see the new proposals coming forward and we could discuss before we get into the Active List. Does everybody understand that? Okay, good. All right.

So moving on to III-B, review, discussion and action on Matrix 9/2011, updated as of 10/3/2011. New proposals received September 26th, 2011, starting with Proposal 3.39, Proposal to amend Section 3-1, Composition, to move the jurisdiction of Kahoolawe from

10/10/2011

District 2, West Maui residency to District 5, South
Maui residency, and to clarify the relationship for the
Maui County Council and the Kahoolawe Island Reserve
Commission which is created by state law, see HRS
Chapter 6K.

Is there a motion to move this proposal -- or you guys need some time?

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I haven't found the document.

CHAIR STONE: Sure. It's, actually, in the

letter.

MS. BRODER: I tried to do it — I did it the way, Commissioner, that you requested last time, and I put it right in the letter. But I also put it at the end of the Matrix. People from the public wanted one document, so I did it both ways. It's right here in the

CHAIR STONE: Do I have a motion to move this to the Active List?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No motion.

Moving forward. Sorry. One second. Let me get organized. Moving forward, next new proposal, Number 3.40, proposal for amend section -- I think that should read "to" -- proposal to amend Section 3-1, Composition, to have three districts and three

10/10/2011

councilpersons from each district, and have the districts organized as follows: (1), Lanai, Lahaina, and part of South Maui, (2), Molokai, Kahului and maybe Paia, and, (3), part of South Maui, Upcountry and Hana. Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Motion to move to general discussion under voting districting on the Active List. CHAIR STONE: Do I have a second? VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Second. MEMBER SUGIMURA: Second. CHAIR STONE: I am going to give that to you. Commissioner Sugimura seconded the motion. Discussion? MEMBER MOIKEHA: None. CHAIR STONE: Lisa, roll call to move that to the Active List, please. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa. MEMBER BAXA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello. MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon. MEMBER DELEON: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego. MEMBER DE REGO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani. 1 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. 2 3 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. 4 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto. 5 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes. 6 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Sugimura. 7 MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes. 8 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger is excused. 9 10 Chair Stone. CHAIR STONE: Yes. 11 MS. KAHUHU: Motion passes. 12 CHAIR STONE: Very good. 13 14 Moving forward. New Proposal Number 8.7.13, 15 proposal to add to Number 8.7.2 to include the following language: "Four out of the nine members of the Fire and 16 Public Safety Commission shall be nominated to the Mayor 17 18 by the fire fighters labor union. The fire fighters 19 labor union shall submit names of nominees for up to 20 four out of the nine Fire and Public Safety Commissioners that shall be appointed by the Mayor and 21 22 confirmed by the Council in the matter prescribed in 23 Section 13-2." 24 MEMBER OKAMOTO: I move that we move 8.7.13 25 and, on the next page, 8.7.14 to our general discussion

1 on the Fire. 2 CHAIR STONE: Very good. We have a motion. 3 Do I have a second? MEMBER CRIVELLO: Second. 4 5 CHAIR STONE: Motion's been seconded by 6 Commissioner Crivello. Any discussion on that? 7 (No response.) 8 CHAIR STONE: We'll take that to vote. Lisa, 9 roll call, please. 10 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused. 11 Commissioner Sugimura. 12 MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes. 13 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto. 14 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes. 15 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. 16 17 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto. 18 MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes. 19 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani. 20 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon. 21 22 MEMBER DELEON: Yes. 23 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego. 24 MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. 25 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello.

10/10/2011 76

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes. 1 2 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa. 3 MEMBER BAXA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Chair Stone. CHAIR STONE: Yes. 5 MS. KAHUHU: Motion passes. 6 7 CHAIR STONE: Very good. Motion passes. 8 Moving on to New Proposal Number 8.16.8, 9 proposal to establish an Independent Office of County 10 Auditor, to have the Commission of Government --11 Commission on Government be attached to the Office of 12 County Auditor, and to have the Commission on Government 13 have the power to hire and fire the County Auditor. 14 MEMBER DE REGO: Chair, I would like to move 15 that this issue be moved to the Active List when we 16 discuss the Office of County Auditor. 17 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Second. CHAIR STONE: Motion, seconded by Commissioner 18 19 Hedani. Any discussion? 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIR STONE: Let's put it to vote. Lisa, 22 roll call please. 23 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa. 24 MEMBER BAXA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello.

25

10/10/2011

,	10/10/2011 77
. 1	MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes.
2	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon.
3	MEMBER DELEON: Yes.
4	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego.
5	MEMBER DE REGO: Yes.
6	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto.
7	MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes.
8	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani.
9	VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes.
10	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha.
11	MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes.
12	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto.
13	MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes.
14	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Sugimura.
15	MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes.
16	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger is excused.
17	Chair Stone.
18	CHAIR STONE: Yes.
19	MS. KAHUHU: Motion passes.
20	CHAIR STONE: Motion passes.
21	Moving forward. New Proposal Number 13.10,
22	proposal to amend Article 13, General Provisions,
23	Section 2, Boards and Commissions, to add provisions
24	requiring the County to indemnify and fund the legal
25	representation of members of boards and commissions in

10/10/2011 78

the event of civil action as a result of the lawful 2 performance of their duties. MEMBER DE REGO: Mr. Chair, I would like to 3 move that this proposal be moved to the Active List under Boards and Commissions. 5 MEMBER DELEON: Second. 6 7 CHAIR STONE: We have a first from Commissioner De Rego, second by Commissioner DeLeon. Do 8 9 we have any discussion? 10 (No Response.) 11 CHAIR STONE: No discussion. Let's put it to 12 vote. Lisa, roll call. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused. 13 14 Commissioner Sugimura. 15 MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto. 16 17 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes. 18 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha. 19 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto. 20 MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes. 21 22 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani. 23 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon. 24 MEMBER DELEON: Yes. 25

10/10/2011 79 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego. 1 2 MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. 3 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello. 4 MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa. 5 MEMBER BAXA: Yes. 7 MS. KAHUHU: Chair Stone? 8 CHAIR STONE: Yes. 9 MS. KAHUHU: Motion passes. CHAIR STONE: Very good. Motion passes. 10 11 Moving on to new Proposal Number 8.7.15, 12 proposal to amend Sections 8-9.4, 8-12.2, 8-13.2 and 13 8-13.4 to create consistency in the powers and duties of 14 the Fire and Public Safety, Police, Liquor, and the Civil Service Commissions and the due process afforded 15 16 directors of these departments in the event of 17 dismissal. 18 MEMBER DE REGO: Mr. Chair, I would move to

move this proposal to the Active List when we discuss these boards and commissions -- these commissions.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Do I have a second?

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Second.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Crivello, second.

Discussion?

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

٩

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(No Response.)

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

80

CHAIR STONE: No. Let's take it to vote.

Lisa, roll call, please.

MS, KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused.

Chair Stone.

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Motion passes.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Motion passes.

10/10/2011

81

I'd just like to point out we may touch base on some of these items in our Active List discussion today, so make sure you keep this document handy. Very good.

Moving on to our next item of business, Item Number IV, Proposed Charter Amendments Active Proposal List; review, discussion and action on active proposals for substantive changes to the Maui County Charter List updated as of October 3rd, 2011.

MEMBER DELEON: Chair, how would you want to proceed on this? We've got a broad base here.

CHAIR STONE: Right. Very good. This is the time to discuss that. What we had discussed at our last meeting is we're going to go -- bring up the subject matter on the Active List, we're going to go around the table, let every Commissioner have a statement about the Active List, and then go back around the table and let Commissioners have another statement after hearing the other Commissioners' discussion. We'll see how it's going. If you have nothing to say, say "no comment" or "listening." And we will open it up, obviously, to debate at a certain stage, but I want to see how this works out, first. All right. And if it's not working out, we're not getting our job done, we'll change the

this Article 3.

1 Yes, Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Will we be working from the 2 3 October 3rd list now? CHAIR STONE: Active Proposals for Substantive 4 5 Changes, October 3rd, yes. 6 MEMBER MOIKEHA: My other question is, if we 7 were going to --CHAIR STONE: Yes, that's the date, 2100, by 8 9 the way. 10 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay. 11 CHAIR STONE: Just a note, let's change that on your -- to 2011. I think that's what Sherry was 12 13 going for. 14 Yes, Commissioner Moikeha. 15 MEMBER MOIKEHA: I thought we were proceeding 16 and at least starting in some kind of chronological 17 order as it appears. So I was wondering why district --18 the subject of district elections, and what happened to 19 the Preamble and the -- did that come -- was that on 20 there? CHAIR STONE: Sherry, just to be 100 percent 21 22 sure, so I don't look like a complete fool, that didn't 23 get on the Active List? 24 MS. BRODER: No. MEMBER MOIKEHA: This is where we started, 25

2 CHAIR STONE: So, lo and behold, look where we 3 start. The easy one. We're starting with district 4 elections. Fantastic. MEMBER OKAMOTO: I guess I'm lost. 5 6 MEMBER CRIVELLO: I'm lost, too. CHAIR STONE: Oh. 7 8 MEMBER OKAMOTO: The one I'm looking at starts 9 with the Preamble. 10 CHAIR STONE: You're looking at the Matrix. 11 MEMBER DELEON: Keep on going. Keep on going. 12 CHAIR STONE: This is the Active Proposal 13 List. MEMBER OKAMOTO: What's the number at the 14 15 bottom? 16 CHAIR STONE: It is 1-14. Page, right, 1-14. 17 IV-A, yeah. Okay. Everybody got it before we start? 18 Okay. 19 So this is a -- no. I think, basically, we're 20 delving into the issue. And there's a number of 21 proposals here on the table. What we should do, I 22 guess, is take a second, maybe, to review the proposals 23 that are on the table for district voting, and then 24 begin our discussion. So why don't -- let's give 25 everybody a good five minutes to remind themselves what

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

84

the proposals are on the table before we enter into the discussion. All right? Okay. Ready, set, go.
(Off the record, 11:45 a.m. to 11:51 a.m.)

CHAIR STONE: So what we'll do is, to make it fun and exciting, we'll start going one way around the table and the other way back around the table so everybody has a fair chance to speak. What I would like to do is put this first round limit at two minutes, try to keep it under two minutes, the discussion.

Yes, Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: I need a longer statement than

that.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon, you're getting two times to talk.

MEMBER DELEON: I'm not going to be able to complete the thought. I have yet to complete the thought in the whole time we've had these discussions. I've been cut off at the seams every time I try to bring up the thought. I would like to complete the thought.

CHAIR STONE: What we're going to do is we'll go around this first time, come back the second, and then we're going to, obviously, have major debate. So let's get our -- this is to get our general feelings and ideas on the table so that we know where we're starting this discussion off. All right? Is that okay?

10/10/2011

85

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Clarification? CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Crivello. 2 3 MEMBER CRIVELLO: So are we taking each --4 CHAIR STONE: No, it is a general discussion. 5 MEMBER CRIVELLO: Okay. 6 CHAIR STONE: All right. So, birthday boy. 7 (Laughter.) 8 MEMBER DE REGO: Oh, I get the honor of 9 starting this off, huh? 10 CHAIR STONE: And I'm timing. Go ahead. MEMBER DE REGO: Actually, I have a very short 11 12 remark to start off with. It's looking at each of 13 these, and it's been my position that it would be unfair 14 to the voters and, I think, not clear if we just put a 15 general amendment about district voting on the ballot and then somehow, miraculously, work it out later. We 16 17 did contract, in some shape or form, the GIS Department 18 to have some sort of software capability to be able to 19 look at each of these in an individual sort of way 20 exactly how it would look. I think this is the time now 21 to employ that group, and to take the specific 22 recommendations in what I would call models for each of 23 these district voting recommendations and to get them 24 sort of divided up and have us to be able to look at it. 25 CHAIR STONE: That's it, Frank?

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

88

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MEMBER DE REGO: That's it. CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you. 2 3 Commissioner Sugimura. MEMBER SUGIMURA: So I would like -- as far as 4 5 this district voting issue, there's words in there which 6 I need clarification. Like self-rule, what does that mean? What would be the powers and duties of self-rule 8 mean versus being a councilmember, in that capacity. 9 And just with the composition, like what Frank is 10 talking about -- I think he kind of answered my 11 question -- how would that be divided up and what does 12 that mean to the general picture? So that's kind of my 13 questions. CHAIR STONE: Very good. 14 15 Commissioner Moikeha.

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Thank you, Chair. My comments are pretty straightforward, simple.

I like what the West Maui Taxpayers put in their letter; "We realize that this is a complex issue that will touch all citizens of Maui County." And I know in testimonies that I've heard and positions that Commissioners have put forth here, it seems like it's trying to -- they want it to be something very simplistic, and it's not.

And for the very reasons that my previous

Commissioners before me stated, this is a very complex issue. I, too, would support having GSI or GIS come down and do their modeling and take a look at this. It's very unfortunate that of all that I've heard in testimony and limited discussions here on this subject, that there's no data. There's just people's subjective opinions that this is what the system is, it works for me or it doesn't. And I want to see some data. I want to see some data that shows me how this makes it unfair. this at-large system. I want to see data that gives me the pros and cons of something different or something that we have already. And those are the kind of things that I'm looking for, more factual base, more objective. And I know surveys and all of that can be designed to sway you a certain way, but we haven't seen anything. I've heard a lot of testimony. Even RAM didn't conduct their own survey of their members to find out where their position stood. So I need more information.

And if we want to go down the road of picking some of these models and portraying them out there and seeing what we can see from that, that would be part of it, but I need to see a specific model that's going to work for all of Maui County and not just for the Island of Maui residents and voters. So I think there's still much more that needs to be presented to persuade me to

10/10/2011

move in either direction.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.
Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: For the record, I've written out my statement so you can see exactly what the logic of my thoughts are. I'm not very good at doing this -- doing it this way.

Basically, as an observer for decades, I've noticed how -- how there's distortions in the system and -- but I've never really got really interested in it. I watched the fact that -- that, you know, it's absurd for councilmembers to go home to Molokai, Lanai, Hana. I mean, that's impossible. I notice that they frequently ran without competition or a lot of votes were left blank. But it never really got into focus for me until the Kaho'ohalahala case. And that comes down to if they don't have to live on the island, then what is the point of this (inaudible) system? And it isn't just Mr. Kaho'ohalahala. Mr. Gima, in his testimony on Lanai, said he's also suing Mr. Hokama because he doesn't live there as well.

When I lived in Kahului, Goro Hokama lived across the street from me. His wife, his kids, his family lived in a house driveway to driveway straight across the street for two years. Apparently, the rules

10/10/2011

89

didn't count then, either.

The cost. You know, we have this -- there's -- there are real heavy duty costs to democracy and this system. Communities are stuck with representatives that they don't want because an incumbent doesn't have to represent a district, even though the Council is really organized in districts. If you pay attention, they really are. Two of the three councilmembers, and usually the Molokai and Lanai councilmembers, run without competition every election. And one of those people usually end up being the Council Chair. Molokai and Lanai incumbents run with little or no competition because they've never been defeated, ever. The last serious attempt was by Henry Olivo, in 1988 and 1990. He was an intelligent, handsome, capable, ex-Marine Beret, corporate executive, very capable guy. Didn't have a Maui base, didn't stand a chance. He lost two elections. He fought really hard and went down hard. And he was capable. He was a guy, he ended up being the Parks Director under Lingle.

So why do we have this system?

Lanai -- and so the lesson is, the Lanai and Molokai incumbents will never be beaten. This is a very serious distortion in a democracy.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon, we'll come

10/10/2011

back to your thought.

MEMBER DELEON: Boy, that's really hard, Mr. Chair. That's really hard. I mean, I've sat through these discussions, and we've never really had a chance to discuss it. Now I'm ready, and I can't even finish my thought. Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair, I think I understand a little bit of the issue, but not as much. I am one of those who would like to see a model so that I could compare the general residency versus what is being proposed today. That's all that I have to say.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much, Commissioner Baxa.

Vice-Chair.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: On the question of district elections, I've heard a lot. I've heard a lot of testimony from the islands of Lanai and Molokai. My general feeling is that there are too many moving parts in the proposal, that the "I"s are not dotted, the "T"s are not crossed. We've gone 50 years, basically, since the Charter was first created. And the system that we have today has withstood the test of that time. If we're going to change to another system, then it has to

be something where everything gets answered and we understand completely how it's going to work. And to date, I haven't seen all of those perspectives addressed.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.
The Chair is presently listening. So,

Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Did you want to go ahead?
CHAIR STONE: No. I'm good. I'm listening.
MEMBER CRIVELLO: Okay, you're listening.
As I go through these different amendment
proposals, you know, I note quite a bit the word
"without" or "leave out" or "they don't count," Molokai

"without" or "leave out" or "they don't count," Molokai and Lanai. So I have to take a stand to get some clear clarification how powers of the Council is run, and how the ordinances and resolutions affect Molokai and Lanai. We're not left out of the -- that bucket. Everything that comes before us from the Council, they have the power, and whatever they pass, whatever ordinance they pass affects Molokai and Lanai, unless -- unless someone can show me otherwise. So district voting, if it's fair and equitable for the people of Lanai and Molokai, then that's maybe something we want to consider, at least on behalf of the less populated districts. Unless we are not part of Maui County, then -- then we have another

discussion.

So I need to know, also, what is self-rule.

What does -- how does a residency -- maybe that's what
we have to look more into, the residency and how we have
that the people who have to enforce these rules pay more
attention to -- to -- so I think there is many more
discussions, and more clarification from those who
support district voting can help to give us the kind of
model that they're looking at, that the beneficiaries of
Molokai, Lanai and Hana are not left out. If you're
saying Maui Nui, then, you know, that does include us,
also.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yeah, I also agree with -gee, I want to call her Stephanie, too. I guess it got
stuck in my head. But what I have to say about this
matter is this: I believe that we need to ask this
question, first of all, so we can clarify, whether we
need to put this question of changing our present system
to single district, for example. But I think the -- the
first question that needs to be asked is do the people
of Maui want to change the system. I think that's the
primary question, is, do the people of Maui want to
change from the current system. Just remember now that

10/10/2011

the people voted for the system we're in now. It's not something we're trying; it was voted for. If we give them another system -- whatever system that happens to be -- that is different from the one we now have, that is -- that has been voted upon and adopted, and been in place at least 10 years, then -- then we may be sort of forcing it upon our people. So I think that what we need to do is ask that question, do you want to change.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Thank you very much, Commissioner Hashimoto.

Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I have my notes. (Laughter.)

CHAIR STONE: You're prepared.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I'm prepared. Well, before
-- as i thought about this, my whole philosophy on the
Charter is that we should only make a change if it's
really going to benefit people. We should make as few
changes as possible. It's like the Constitution, after
200 years, how few changes have been made. And so in
looking at everything, I'm really looking at that, that
we only change if it's a way to improve.

And I also tried to think if I weren't from Lanai. And, honestly, if I weren't, I would still want the system we have because I feel like Maui is one unit.

We're not like the mainland. One of our testifiers talked about having different systems. I don't think he lived where there were different islands. And so I think we have to think of it in that respect. We are Maui, in one unit.

And I like the idea of having to vote for nine people. Yes, it may require me to study a little more.

Well, I'm sorry, I didn't think that voting was going to be easy. We do need to study the candidates.

And I also don't think we need to just make it because it's cheaper. We've had a candidate in the past who was the highest vote-getter and spent very little money. So I don't -- I don't go for that.

And I just -- I think much of the testimony that we did hear was -- it was that, well, it's easier for people to run for office. And I just don't think that's a good excuse. It's also, well, we keep electing the same people. Well, we keep electing Dan Inouye and we keep electing Akaka. Hawaii is known for that. In fact, mainland is known for it, too. I lived in a state that had Carl Hayden forever. So that's -- you know, that is just politics. People get reelected because of their name.

And I think that's -- that's -- the arguments that I heard, I don't always put validity with some of

them just for that. They're valid arguments for something, but not to change a system that the voters did decide on when they originally accepted the Charter. And so that's my position.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. So we've heard everybody's -- everybody's thoughts on the matter. It seems like we need more information. So what I'd like to do, instead of going back around the room at this point, is if a Commissioner would like to continue for a bit more, please raise your hand and you may finish your thoughts.

Commissioner DeLeon and then Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I'm confused. What are we doing now?

CHAIR STONE: Well, to me, it seems like we're not at a stage where we can truly dig into this. We need GIS back to look at possibilities. It doesn't seem that any Commissioner is ready to take a full stand at the moment because they just don't have enough information in front of them. So I think what we're going to need to do is dig -- get all the information that the Commissioners require. After this round of discussion, what I would like to do is go to each Commissioner and say, "What do you need to make a final

10/10/2011

opinion or formulate a final opinion?" Because that's what we need to get to eventually.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So, then, I understand you're going to eliminate the second go-round and just let us have conversation.

CHAIR STONE: Yes. Just quickly, short conversation, two minutes each, raise your hand, and -- and then we're going to discuss about what we need. All right? Because I can see right now, we're not going to -- nobody's taking a stand. So --

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair, I haven't even had a chance to get to a stand. I haven't even completed the beginning of my thought.

CHAIR STONE: Well, Commissioner -- MEMBER DELEON: Well, I mean --

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon, please.

MEMBER DELEON: Okay. So, so far, I've

pointed out that communities are stuck with representatives they don't want, two or three councilmembers always run without competition, Lanai and Molokai councilmembers run with no competition because they never get defeated.

I would like to point out that the testimony pointed out again today that this is a very inequitable operation we have now. It's, you know, Lanai with 3,000 10/10/2011

10/10/2011

residents, and Wailuku with 28,000, and they get the same amount of Council representation.

I would like to point out the testimony -- and
I know the -- the idea this is at-large election is an
illusion -- I mean, the at-large election is not an
illusion, but the fact that it's not districts is an
illusion. It is very much a district operation in the
County Council, especially when you get down to budgets.

And I would like to speak to point out the Zach Helm's statement to us at the Molokai hearing: I started off with five positions on Molokai, back in 1982. I had 30 positions. And I have to thank our Council representative, you know, for providing these jobs because it really helps us economically. If we -- if we -- if we lose that voice, we may not be able to get the things we've gotten now.

But that's what we're really talking about here. We're talking about budget leverage beyond what the small populations of these small communities can justify. The leverage is compounded in each case because most Molokai and Lanai councilmembers invariably turn out to be the Council Chairs.

The voters don't like the system we have now.

That's evidenced by the fact there's a 20 percent blank rate in every election, every election. The West Maui

taxpayers put it this way: "We are finding that a large number of county voters are simply not voting for Council positions because they either do not recognize the candidates or feel that the candidates do not represent them and where they live." We need to make a voting system — voting system be easier, more transparent, more logical, in a word, more fair for Maui County residents.

Last year, there was a survey of Maui County voters, a scientific survey done by QMark. This is the information sheet that they sent out before -- before the survey was conducted to show what they were talking about. It went to every voter. That survey said 65 percent of the Maui County voters wants to see change in the election system. There's ample evidence the fact that this community wants to see a change. The Kaho'ohalahala case highlighted that evidence. It's clear and it's really -- now it's on this Commission's responsibility. I'm sorry, I'm not -- I would rather read the thing. I thought I would have more time to do

This question's come up before, but it's never been -- never before had the issues been so clearly drawn. Never before the voter's interest in seeing it brought to a vote been so clear. Our current system is

developed over time, and none of the distortions noted were deliberately set, but they are now noted and known and clearly delineated. And this Commission is on notice that we have, in fact, a broken system. And the voters want it changed to address that issue.

Commission Molkeha points out that -- that -- you know, so what's the evidence of the broken system.

That is the highlighted points I've put in here.

They're very real and they -- they affect the ability for the voters to be able to treat this like a democracy.

Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner DeLeon.

Any other Commissioner have a statement?

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Well, I will -- I will go

ahead and continue. I believe that a lot of the numbers that we've given, I think we all — the whole thing with QMark, we never got any answers on how those things came about. At one point, someone said hundreds of people have spoken for the district voting. I went through our count and I sure didn't find hundreds. Yes, there are people who have spoken. Many of them have spoken more than once on the same issue. So I think there is an exaggeration in the numbers.

And I really -- I feel like we've gotten into

10/10/2011

personalities a couple times that we shouldn't, but I do have to answer to those.

I don't believe that Mr. Kaho`ohalahala's issue has anything to do with district voting. It wouldn't have mattered whether he was -- if you had pure districts, you'd have the same problem. That's a totally separate issue, that's a residency issue.

Because he could have been elected from Upcountry, we'd had the same issue. So I don't believe that that should even come into play.

And I do -- and I know we're not supposed to debate, but I do have to -- I lived on Lanai all the time that Goro was representative. His children went to school on Lanai. His wife lived on Lanai. He came home on many weekends. Obviously, not every weekend. I went to church with him many, many weeks. So to say -- yes, he lived with his daughter after she was an adult here, while he was serving, but, yes, he did live on Lanai. And we saw him quite often.

The one thing that -- and I see it as a sort of progression, we now do not have a Maui County Fair. We have a Maui Fair. And that just really hit me. Is that where we're going, Maui is it, the rest of it doesn't count? You know, Maui County is one unit, we have to look at everybody.

10/10/2011

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. And point of clarification, now is the time to debate.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Thank you.

another comment? Commissioner Crivello.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you very much. Commissioners, would anybody like to make

MEMBER CRIVELLO: I'm willing to take a stand.

I can understand where the proponents for district voting is coming from. What I do not understand is how you can eliminate districts that are considered part of the county, part of Maui County. Unless it's otherwise, then don't exclude the districts that are part of Maui County.

You mention, Commissioner DeLeon, about our representatives from Lanai and Molokai. We take some pride. I mean, we've had Mayor Lingle who started off as our councilwoman, and ended up being Governor. We had the late Council Pat Kawano, who served for many years as Chair of the Council. And, today, we have Chair Mateo. So how unknown to Maui and to Molokai are these representatives?

So in all fairness, perhaps Brother Zach was able to increase his Parks Department, perhaps it started from Council Linda Lingle's time, too. And that's how far back it goes in the Parks and Recreation.

So maybe it's an accumulation of times. I think we need to get more details.

We're also left out quite a bit. But you know what? We sustain it. And, you know, this may not be the best, but it's what we have. And we have been able to work it well, not only on behalf of Molokai and Lanai, but all of Maui. It's -- we're -- we don't isolate ourselves because we're Molokai. We take pride.

And nature separates us by water. And that's something that we live with. And one thing that at least we're not deprived of is having direct representation with our resident councilperson.

If -- we have, on the State level, single district. Our house of representative lives on Maui, our senator lives on Maui. And we have to put up with the representation of not being directly from our island. And -- and we know the difference.

So I don't see why we should be without. Wards and townships and self-rule, whatever else is put before us with the proponents of removing or -- or separating us, my question to you would be, how would you separate the districts that's on Maui? In this district voting, how will we separate -- or will there be a separation of districts for Wailuku and Kahului? Does that come with the district -- district voting,

too?

So I take my stand. I have — I don't see where district voting would be of full benefit for all of the County of Maui.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner.
Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: I'm just going to follow up on what I said earlier. The reason for the -- for asking that question is, you know, we have sat here, all of us have sat here, and listened to people walking in and talking about district voting. We've heard it more today than we heard it before. And it's one meeting. Before that, though, we didn't have that. Now -- and even though we've heard a lot of people speaking in favor of district voting, these -- these are just very small numbers of people who had really spoken, you know, in favor of that. There are 82,000 voters on Maui. And we've heard, what, a very small percentage of people who have spoken up in favor of single-district voting. So I still believe that -- that we can't base our -- whatever conclusions we come to purely on -- on a few number of people who seem to be in favor of single-district

I really go back to that question again, do the people of Maui want to change the system that has

10/10/2011

been with us now for 20 years, or however long it's been.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much, Commissioner.

Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: So I have a question regarding this document here. And I guess -- correct me if I'm wrong, Dave, but I think it was presented like this was a piece that was distributed to -- I don't know who.

MEMBER DELEON: To the voters.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: To the voters, okay. So this is from the North Beach West Maui Benefit Fund, Inc., that Lahaina group. And I think this is the same group that we're waiting for that QMark study back. But I remember at the time, when we were going through this discussion, that I think Commissioner Moikeha said that because it wasn't validated through data or even through community meetings, or whatever, it looked like it was like these four commissioners or representatives who actually represented that group, the West Maui -- I don't know what they're called already -- I would have to study it. But -- so, therefore, I think this is the same -- same fancy publication, a lot of money that was

spent for information, but it didn't go further than

10/10/2011

that.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Actually, this was a preliminary piece that went out, and then the 500 voters were called in a random professional survey by QMark.

Now, this Commission never made an effort to bring QMark in here. I mean, that was your prerogative as a commission to bring him in here. If you're going to challenge them, have the opportunity to talk to them. Nobody's taken that effort to do that. Make the effort if that's what you think.

And, Stacy, if you want to look at what a district looks like, that's what was described here. So that's – that's what's answering your question what a district would look like. Excuse me.

Clifford, on your point about the voters picked the system and created this system, the voters moved from one at-large system to another at-large system 20 years ago. It didn't really change. It wasn't ever a single-member district.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: I didn't say that.

MEMBER DELEON: Single-member district.

Basically, a small variation on the same game, including the -- the Hana District, the Hana seat, in creating,

1 2

3

4

5

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and got rid of the at-large seats, the nonspecific non-district entities, and ended up with nine districts. But it was still an at-large race. Nothing -- nothing significantly changed in that reference in order to be able to protect Lanai and Molokai's current position. That was the goal of that. And, to me, it's kind of a cynical thing to

say, well, the incumbents always get elected. So why even bother having elections, then? I mean, if the incumbents are always going to win, why bother? I mean, let's not even bother having elections.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Well, you know, I believe -- if I may?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Hashimoto. MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Well, I believe, you know,

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. MEMBER DELEON: I would like to support, though, Cliff's concept of putting a simple question to

that -- that is, you know, your opinion, Commissioner. I have my own personal opinion as well. But I have not tried to do that. I have not tried to influence anybody in here based on my -- my own opinion and -- and what I like or what I dislike. I only asked the question. MEMBER DELEON: Okay. Mr. Chair?

the public, do you want to change the system. I think

10/10/2011

108

I believe that the idea of one man, one vote is really an ideal. It is. And, yet, it bothers me that if we go strictly to the point, it may really occur that Lanai, Molokai, and even Hana, may actually be totally deprived of the right of representation. And, to me, consideration of the right of the minority, small group of people, is very important in a democracy.

The United States, big as it is, is a great country. I think every one of us recognizes that America is the greatest country in the world because it recognizes the right of minorities. And at this point, I consider the island -- the people of Lanai and Molokai to be in that category. So much for that.

As far as the Kaho'ohalahala question is concerned, I do not think that is an issue in district voting. Kaho`ohalahala question/issue pertains to residency. That is separate. It has nothing to do with the residency question.

There was an argument by Mr. DeLeon. And I respect his intelligence and I respect the hard work that he did. And he means that with all his heart, I give him that. But he keeps on saving that Molokai and Lanai, because of the councilman's power, they get most of what they want. Until today, I am not convinced that

there's too much inertia in our current status quo that it would be too hard to move the status quo. And I think the public needs to be asked. If you don't trust a professional survey organization like QMark, then maybe the professional organization that ought to make the question is the Clerk's Office on the ballot. And then we can ask the question formally, and then have -have it done in a real formal -- formal and non-equivocal manner. Ask the question, do we want to change the way we elect our County Council, put it to the voters.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Oh. Sorry. Who is that beautiful woman? You come in here, disrupt our meeting, looking sexy and all. Get out of here. That's our pizza delivery girl.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair, this is a very important question. I know that we have different thoughts. And I would not say anything any more, but, lest, everybody suspects that I do not have any thoughts on this, I might as well go on record.

10/10/2011

109

progress of the other portions of Maui, have surpassed the other districts. To me, Lanai and Molokai remains at the bottom.

I don't know if you have an answer to that. These are important considerations for me. I have to consider the rights of what I believe as far as minorities within this country. Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much, Commissioner.

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Thank you.

I just want to clarify a few things that were said, because they were on the record. In regards to the QMark and my comment at that time, after some discussion as to when this came out and how much of it was from public input, my concern with that was that I took it -- this working group's document, including their survey, as individual testimony, and not representation of the public of Lahaina. At one point in time, in the minutes, it does reflect this, that they were representing that they spoke for the public of the west side. My concern about that, after discussion, was that that's not what I found to be true.

Whatever work they did propose in this documentation, wherever they have presented it in the

5 6 7

1

2

3

4

8 9 10

> 11 12 13

14 15 16

> 17 18 19

Lanai and Molokai, in relationship to the economic

24

R

county, to me, is a working group of four individuals.

And for me, it's validated because it comes from them.

And it's like anyone else in the public eye, that stands up here and shares their opinion. Likewise, any one of us. So this, for me, was individuals that got together and produced a document of their positions on many amendments to the Charter, one of them being the district voting.

In regards to the QMark, which Mr. DeLeon relies heavily on as the -- the greatest survey ever, to give us all the data we need, we differ on that opinion. Because I don't see that.

And, yes, we did request it, and it still has not come forth. Mr. De Rego had requested it many times. And it would be a good idea for us today, when we go through our list, if we could have a telephone conversation with those that actually conducted this.

So right now, it's just out there for information purposes.

In regards to some of the issues that

Mr. DeLeon raises in his -- in his dissertation, which I
respect -- I think Dave feels very passionate about the
things that he puts forth here, as many other people do.
And I respect that, even if I'm not in agreement with
it. I don't always agree with everything that everybody

says, but, for me, I respect that that's their opinion.

And this is his opinion. He cites things that he views as his rationale. When I look at things -- and I have thought about this -- the voters don't like or understand the current system, every election there is a 20 percent blank rate in Council races. In his opinion, that means something. In my opinion, it means, are you a mind-reader, did you go to the polls, did you talk to people that cast a blank vote?

And this is why I always appreciate people that come to testify and share their personal experiences with this whole issue. I've heard the same general things, pretty much what Mr. DeLeon has proposed here in support of his argument, coming forth from the general public. And I want to hear some personal experience.

As a voter, myself, I have cast a blank vote.

First of all, being a -- having the privilege
to vote in a democracy gives certain privacy. We go to
the voting polls, we close that little curtain, and the
only person that knows where we stand on our views and
who we cast our vote for is us, unless we share that.

i've heard very little people talk about their experiences in their voting. And here's mine: When I had to vote for a mayor this last election, I left a

10/10/2011

blank vote because neither one of them, to me, aligned with my values and views that I could support either one. And — and that's where I stood. A lot of times, when I look at Council districts at-large, I may personally not like that person, and there's no one else running, okay, I don't want to cast a vote, let the rest of the world decide who is going to run and represent you. That doesn't mean that I don't understand the system. That doesn't mean that I'm ignorant or, you know, I don't care. That's my personal stance. And that's where I'm coming from.

There's a lot of things here that I've heard that can be — go either way. And we can cancel each other out all day long. But the gist of all of this comes back to a specific model. I have not seen a specific model that I think is going to be fair and equitable to everyone.

And maybe that just requires more time. This issue has been along — around for a long time. And no one has really grasped it and taken it and investigated it and dissected it. And we always get to these crisis moments of emergency, we got to decide now, we got to have it on the ballot. Well, the Council had full control of that last year. And what did they do? They kicked it to us. Why? Why didn't they take the time to

10/10/2011

have a subcommittee and really investigate this issue and see where we are? And let's look at the pros and cons of both sides of this story. Because I haven't seen all of that information come out yet. I've heard a lot of opinions from very passionate people who believe what they believe. And they take the time to come here and share it. And I've heard the exact same thing from the people that have committed their year service here, you know. My opinion, your opinion. Everybody has an opinion.

In making decisions, for me, it is going to be about how I weigh everything. And I do come from a more analytical detail, give me some facts, help me tip that scale one way or another.

The other part of that issue, too, in my decision-making, my personal decision-making, has a lot to do with, also, some subjective feelings that I get.

I was in those meetings on Molokai and Lanai and Hana where this issue will affect them the most. They will be greatly impacted the most. And when I listened to their concerns and their issues and where they're coming from and their experience -- let me also tell you, I spent a lot of time in those communities in my life. In being a resident of South Maui for 32 years and on this island since 1977, I have spent time in

blank

1

2

3

4

9 10 11

25

1 2

3

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

20

those communities. I spent a lot of time there in my college days, on Molokai, immersed in the culture of that island. I have done the same in Lanai. They're not my islands, I don't reside there, but I've been there, I've immersed myself in the culture.

And this issue, too, is more than just about weighing the facts; it's a cultural thing. It is indeed a cultural thing, whether we want to talk about that or not. And -- and that's something that is underlying underneath all of that. When you talk about mokus or districts of the ahupua'a system, as I think Mr. Helm was referring to, and those on these islands are referring to, yes, there were districts, there were -this is how they lived, that's how they functioned, that's how they preserved their resources, to live, to sustain their lives. And this issue dips down into that, in my opinion. I'm not a cultural expert. It is my heritage, too, but I'm not a cultural -- but that's the feeling and the passion that I get as I hear, listen and observe.

I don't think this issue is going to be decided in this time, in my personal opinion. There is so much more that needs to be addressed. It is just not going to be another model in the continental USA, how they do it. I'm sorry, I don't believe that.

And I'll leave it at that.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner, very

much.

my notes.

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Commissioners, this is actually very interesting. This is good stuff. This is what I want to hear from you.

So any further discussion? Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Yeah. I would like to address a few different issues.

> CHAIR STONE: In the microphone, please. MEMBER DELEON: I'm sorry. I was looking at

On the idea of disenfranchising Lanai and Molokai, what we're talking about with single-member districts is equal representation. That means everybody gets the same amount of representation equally. You don't get more because you live on a small island anymore. You get the same amount of representation as the other folks in the county. Minorities will not lose representation; they'll get fair representation.

The Kaho'ohalahala case underlines the issue of why we're doing the thing. The whole point of the thing is they're supposed to live on those islands. If they're not living on those islands, why are we doing

10/10/2011

116

it? That is why -- that's why I did put a highlight on it, that's why I did focus the community on this issue.

I'm not done vet.

On the blank votes, I'm not trying to mind-read anybody, but only in the Council races do we have a 20 percent blank vote rate. Susan mentioned that she -- she didn't vote in the Mayor's race. Well, she was part of the two percent that didn't vote in the Mayor's race. And the Council races, for the last number of years, number of elections, it's been 20 percent blanks. People aren't getting it.

And let me read the statement again from -- I never got to it here -- from the West Maui Taxpayers. "We are finding that a large number of county voters are simply not voting for Council positions because they either do not recognize the candidates or feel that the candidates do not represent them and where they live. We need to make the voting system easier, more transparent, more logical, in a word, more fair for Maui County citizens." That's the West Maui Taxpayers Association. That isn't four citizens. That is the premier representative organization in West Maui.

On the question of cultural -- and I know this is sliding away from Council races, but what we were -what I was speaking to -- and it was Mr. Ritte, and not

10/10/2011

117

Mr. Helm, on Molokai. It was in reference to -- he was talking about creating a moku system that was elected, and that is a traditional system. That's, basically, what I was talking about with island boards. It's, basically, the same thing. So if it's a traditional process, why is it so bad?

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner, Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: With your last comment on the moku, we still come back to, you know, irregardless if you were to have that representation, you would have a complete voice in the aha, or, for us, the Council. And so how does the idea of the islands of Molokai and Lanai and the district of Hana, or other districts -because everybody else would be split up one way or the other -- be included in the full Council powers? I mean, you know, you talk about boards, townships or different mokus or -- or what-have-you.

Molokai certainly would like to be their own voice. There's nothing more that we would want. But being part of the county does not allow that. And so I ask you, how will that be allowed that we're still part of the full decision-making of the Council that affects us as a population?

20 21

22 23

24

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: One man, one vote, you have equal amount of representation as everybody else. If you had island -- island boards, you would have an under structure. Which is an American system, yes, it's something that happens on the mainland, like townships. But Molokai is not going to afford a township. Township means you incorporate, means you run some of your own services. Molokai does need Maui resources. So -- same with Lanai. It would be too hard to do. That's why I suggested that -- and before me, Sarah Sykes suggested --

MEMBER CRIVELLO: She's no longer on Molokai.

MEMBER DELEON: Yeah, I know.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Long time ago.

MEMBER DELEON: Yeah. But, anyway, that was

originally her proposal and it managed to stick in my head. But the concept is that you would have an elected body which you don't have now. You have -- you actually elect nobody on Molokai. Maui elects -- when there is competition, which it hasn't happened in 10 years. When there's competition, Maui elects your representative. Molokai doesn't represent -- doesn't elect anybody. Molokai could represent -- could have its own

representatives and representative voice. So when someone wants to bring in a windmill farm, they would have a body to be able to stand up for them and be able to make -- make the arguments on a broad spectrum, and not just in the County Council.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: So to follow up with that, we do have our voices heard, but that doesn't necessarily mean that we get to make the final decision. And -- and the representation that we have from our resident councilperson allows us this opportunity to have us have that vote. So I think you said it very when you said a board or a township would be under, we want to be on the table, unless -- unless everything is completely 100 percent governance by our island and the people. And -- and the full governance, we live with this model that we have. It's not always to say it's the best, but we live with it. And candidates have run, and once the -- maybe, after a while, they run unopposed. But we know that we can knock on a door and be able to meet with our councilperson on the island. I think that's the difference, you know.

I -- you give me a lot of food for thought, Dave. And I really appreciate that. But I have to stand firm, until we can have a model, that we will not

10/10/2011

1 2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

120

be deprived.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: You know, the maps that were presented in this exhibit from the North Beach West Maui Association kind of convinces me, to some degree. that the system that we have now works better than the systems that are being contemplated. If you look at Map 1, everything is green. One man, one vote, every citizen in the county, on all the islands, has nine votes, a vote for every councilperson. Option 1, Molokai, Lanai, Kahoolawe and Hana, as well as Haiku and Upper Kula, are included in one district. Geographically speaking, because we're four islands, probably the person in Haiku is going to represent Lanai, Molokai and Kahoolawe, whether he knows where Molokai is or not.

In Map 3, same thing. Probably somebody in Haiku is going to represent Lanai, Molokai.

In Map 4, somebody in Kihei is going to represent Lanai, and somebody in Wailuku or Waihee is going to represent Molokai.

What we're looking at is the potential disenfranchisement of the people of Lanai and Molokai from participation in Maui County. We already have --

10/10/2011

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

121

Maui Island already has seven out of the nine councilmembers represented on the Council. And from my perspective, we don't have to (inaudible) all nine Council positions, you know, for the entire -- for the entire island.

In the case of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the Congressional level, you have one system that represents minorities, irrespective of population. Same thing in the State Capitol, you have representatives and senators irrespective of population. In the case of the County Council, it's only one body; it's not bicameral. So you have a situation where you don't have the opportunity to have lesser communities represented by that perspective. The people that are there are the people that are there.

And I think I kind of like the green map that shows everybody voting for everybody.

> CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner Hedani. Commissioners, any further discussion?

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yeah, just --

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: I was going to mention this

to our first testifier today, that -- that, you know, I believe, if my memory serves me right, that 28 percent of the population of Maui is Caucasian. Okay. But we

2

3

4

5

6

7

Я

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Sugimura,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. Any further discussion? Commissioner

MEMBER SUGIMURA: So I guess, before we break for lunch, because I know that's where we're going next --

CHAIR STONE: So you think.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: But I just want to say that, in my work, like Commissioner Moikeha, I have done work with Lanai and Molokai, and not only with this island, and got to know the people. And maybe not as many issues as they have had to live through, but I understand their passion and their -- what they were saying when we went before them. Even Hana. Here we are only talking about Lanai and Molokai, but, really, Hana, I think, has a lot to lose, as we heard the testimony, Clifford, when we went to your -- your community, also.

And I just want to say that until you live there and you know what's happening, where you know what it is to live in those shoes, I think it's hard for us to make the kind of decisions that we think we know what's better for them. And the words in the -- the proposals that came to us that really troubles me are. you know, all these fancy words, townships or whatever. We think we're giving them a fair chance, but -- and a voice, but I think, really, what we need is for them to have what we see today, which is their own representatives for Lanai, Hana and -- and Molokai. And, yeah, the population is not equal, but that's the way it is. It's islands, which gives it a very unique character. And -- and I -- too, I haven't heard any reason why things should, you know, drastically change.

That's my position.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much, Commissioner.

Commissioners, I'm sure everybody is really hungry. So what I'd like to do is, when we come back, after we take our lunch recess, I'd like to discuss what data information we need to get to continue this conversation. And then we will defer this and move on through our Active List until we can organize that information. Is that okay? So we're going to take a

10/10/2011

124

122

half-hour recess. So let's have everybody -- oh, let's make it a little more. Let's make it everybody back here at 12:20, please. So without objection --

MEMBER DELEON: 12:20?

CHAIR STONE: I'm sorry. 1:20. Excuse me. I should be looking at this clock, not that clock, because my eves blur.

So without objection, we'll have our lunch recess now. Thank you very much, Commissioners.

(Recess, 12:47 p.m. to 1:25 p.m.)

CHAIR STONE: I'm going to call the meeting back to order, without objection, at 1:25.

Commissioners, thank you for coming back from lunch.

So we left off with discussion on information needed for the subject matter of district elections. I have here a note to call in GIS. I think Commissioner De Rego mentioned that.

So, Commissioners, any conversation on information needed for that discussion? Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I have some questions about this brochure that was handed out. I'm not sure who presented it to us. Was that from you, Dave?

MEMBER DELEON: Yeah, it was.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay. Because we did request

10/10/2011

125

this, and we have requested it for a long time, to hear from QMark. And so it's time to get them on the phone or some representation here.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I also have some questions for our Analyst, because it seems that person that put this brochure together was Professor Jon Van Dyke.

> MS. BRODER: Is that what it says? MEMBER OKAMOTO: That's what it says.

CHAIR STONE: Dom, dom, dom.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I'd like to know more about

exactly what he did for -- since he is working for us now. I would like to know more about what this was -what this was all about.

MS. BRODER: I, personally, don't know anything about it, but I will ask him. But I guess, just superficially, anyways, looking at it, it looks like it's supposed to -- the maps, anyway, are supposed to just show how it would look.

MEMBER DELEON: Scenarios. MEMBER MOIKEHA: According to the introduction, it said that he was commissioned to provide the educational brochure to help our community better understand. So I'd like to know, did he come up with all the information, or was this written out from

17 18 19

20 21

22 23 24

25

21 22 23

20

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the group and they just said please put this together? He does cite some constitutional requirements for the one man, one vote, which is in line with the question I asked you about before. So I'd like -- as part of that follow-up, this might be where that answer is going to come. But I also felt it interesting in his population, and it almost -- it starts to get into the

paragraph, the challenge presented by Maui County's residency requirement, as if to say that was okay. We didn't necessarily meet the requirements of this lawsuit, but having someone required to live in that area seemed to, I don't know, give it an exemption. So that whole page -- the whole thing has a lot of questions for me. And if he could provide some background on his involvement and what all this means in context of -- really, the issue now becoming for me is whether -- is the at-large district voting illegal? Is any change to it going to pose constitutional challenges or lawsuits or whatever? I mean, those are the kind of things I'm looking at now with this.

And then my other question before all ties in with that.

> CHAIR STONE: Very good. Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: And there's also some

MS. BRODER: Okav.

questioning about the wording.

MEMBER DE REGO: Since this was sent out to. supposedly, all Maui households or registered voters, it seems to me that a lot of the language is already skewed in one direction in terms of supporting one over the other. Because, obviously, the only problems that are pointed out are for the first one --

MS. BRODER: Okay.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- but none for the other three. So it didn't look like it was a pro and con on each one; it looked like it was just a statement of what the present situation is and then the cons of that situation. And then outlining the other three and what the advantages of each would be, but not really any looking at the cons of -- of that as well. So it didn't seem like a well-balanced presentation of all four models.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much. Commissioners, anything else? And, Commissioner De Rego, didn't you mention you had almost had a chance to get one of these QMark

MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. It was a census

10/10/2011

128

meeting, but he left in the middle of it, so I didn't have a chance to blindside him at the meeting in Honolulu, but -- it was a missed opportunity.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Very good. Any other

MEMBER SUGIMURA: So just on this brochure.

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Sugimura.

you also find out who it went to? I don't remember ever getting this. This is the kind of stuff I would love to read, but who it went to. And I guess we know who paid for it, the North Shore West Maui Benefit Fund. Just, you know, why was it sent out and for what reason and

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?

MEMBER DELEON: I received it in the mailbox

as a voter. So I think it went to all voters. But if you just were to receive that with all the other junk mail you get in the course of the day, you might not pay attention to it. It might have went on the way, if you weren't paying attention. So it's a chance that a lot of folks just didn't follow, you know, what it was.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon, just

10/10/2011

guys?

129

clarification, this came simply like this without any kind of a return form?

MEMBER DELEON: The address right here.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: I received one. I just ran into it two weeks ago. And --

MEMBER DELEON: Oh, you ran into it?

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yeah. It was on my desk.

I just didn't pay -- I think I looked at it once and I put it up. And I pulled it back out again to look at it.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: What year was it sent out?

MEMBER DELEON: Last year. It was right

before the QMark. It was supposed to preset the conversation in the community before the QMark survey was held.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: That's a lot of money spent for 500 voters.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Spent 15,000.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

Commissioners, any further information

required for this topic?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Okay. Very good. MS. KAHUHU: Chair, I apologize for

interrupting, will you please clarify for me what these

requests?

since we're --

MEMBER SUGIMURA: -- getting into focus, can

whatever.

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner DeLeon.

MR. KUSHI: Offhand, I would say no.

CHAIR STONE: Sorry, Ed. In the microphone.

MR. KUSHI: Offhand, I would say no because it's not -- it's not a commission member. He would be a resource person. MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. MR. KUSHI: However, I would -- I was going to

tell staff, and we'll talk to the Chair later, to see what kind of budget we're talking about. I think it's easier if you bring him here.

MEMBER DE REGO: Okav.

MR. KUSHI: Then the public would know, it would be an agenda item, and you guys can do face-to-face.

> MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. Thank you. MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Yeah, Commissioner

DeLeon.

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5 6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

5

6

Я

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER DELEON: Is there a possibility of us developing a series of questions we need to have answered and send them a letter the old-fashioned way, or email, whatever you want to do it? But, I mean, just rather than have a big circus about trying to trap somebody into this room to be able to interrogate them.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I would like to have him invited here to appear. I thought telephone would be

10/10/2011

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

132

easiest, less invasive of his time, a telephone conferencing call, where we could interact over the phone and ask questions. But I'm all for bringing him here, too, so the public is totally aware of our process.

CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: And it's not to trap anybody,

it's not to interrogate; it's to ask questions.

CHAIR STONE: Right.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Questions that need to be answered for -- to find out what -- what this was all about. Because we haven't really gotten any definitive answers.

CHAIR STONE: Right. I think, optimally, obviously, if we have the budget and we can get him here, we'll do that. Barring that, phone -over-the-phone meeting. And then, Ed, if, for some reason, we can't get them to call in for a phone meeting or something, would it be -- would it be allowed for the Chair to take the questions and discuss it with QMark, and then report to the Commission, if that is the last -- obviously, not really an optimum way to go, but

MR. KUSHI: I'd suggest -- on your third suggestion, I would say develop a list of questions,

10/10/2011

133

send it to him and have him respond in writing.

CHAIR STONE: It might take a push over the phone is what I'm saying.

MR. KUSHI: Right. Right. Nobody wants to be -- they want to be prepared.

CHAIR STONE: Right.

MR. KUSHI: So make a list of guestions and --

CHAIR STONE: Okay.

MR. KUSHI: If you can't get him here.

CHAIR STONE: If we can't, right. That would

be the best. Okay. Very good.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: I know that you already said that perhaps you would prefer that he appear in person, but then you gave the affirmative that, perhaps, the telephone would be okay. I would prefer, though, as much as possible, if we have the capacity, to bring him over. And so that there will be no surprises, tell him ahead of time what the most -- the general area of the subject matters so he will be prepared. There is not -there is no substitute to face-to-face dialogue.

Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much. That will be, of course, our optimum. We'll target that.

was a joke. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Does that mean we want to go ahead and make -- give you our questions particularly?

Or --

CHAIR STONE: Yeah. Send in -- if anybody has particular questions on the subject matter of the QMark survey, send them to Lisa. She'll forward them to me. Lisa and Ed, please. And they'll forward to me. And we'll do our very best to get QMark here.

Okay. So at this time we're going to defer district elections until we have further information as requested, and move on to next subject matter, nonpartisan elections. We're looking at proposal — or Active Proposals Number 3.13 and Number 3.14. 3.13, proposal to return to a closed primary system; and 3.14, proposal to abolish nonpartisan elections for County Council.

MEMBER DELEON: Chair? CHAIR STONE: Yes, please.

MEMBER DELEON: Can I refer the Commission to

another handout?

CHAIR STONE: Sure.

MEMBER DELEON: This is from a State -- State

Elections Plan, 2004. It shows the registered voters, statewide, on the top, the top group of numbers. And

the second group of numbers, it's the voter turnout. You can watch a progression in this from -- from 19 -- Susan didn't get one -- from 1992 through 2002. And then I added on, just hang-on numbers at the end are something I tagged on, so it's not part of the original document, for 2010. I didn't have them for 2100. That

Anyway, so -- so the thing that happened in -- and -- in 1992, was the Motor Voter Act that the Federal Government passed. And that thing, basically, did two things. That required that the states -- not only required, but encouraged the states to include registration of voters when they -- when folks went to get their driver's license. So now if you go to renew your driver's license -- I assume you all have driver's licenses -- you'll also see a blank on there to register to vote. A lot of folks were encouraged to vote as a way, maybe, to make it easier to get the driver's license, or whatever, and probably never voted.

The other thing that law did was it requires that the -- that the county clerks leave on the -- on the roles, for two elections, people who did not vote.

So the folks who did not vote for two elections stay on.

They used to come off in one election. So -- and we have a very mobile community, so this is compounded. So

10/10/2011

you have folks coming in, getting driver's license, signing up for voting, never voting, staying on the rolls for two elections and then jumping off. So you can see that the progression runs here. So in -- in 1992, we got, basically, an 80 percent voter turnout. And -- and it progresses across so that the registrations jump 30 percent in 10 years. The population didn't jump 30 percent, but the registrations did. And the -- and the voting turnout stayed the same. So, basically, you had the same number of voters over that period of time, but you had a 30 percent increase in registrations.

Now, the reason I'm bringing this up in the course of this conversation about partisan voting is this had nothing to do with partisan voting. This had to do with a federal law that changed in 1992. And I don't see how partisan voting connects with how many registered voters you got. But we do have a progression here of increase in — in registered voters over a period of a decade, and it continued to increase with the population. So now we're up to 85 in the last election. And the — and the percentage stays about the same, right about 50 percent turnout. Back before that — that change in federal law, we were at 80 percent.

So, to me, it's pretty clear evidence that --

10/10/2011

that something really major changed. And what really changed was the federal law that underlies the way we register people to vote. Not -- not the fact that we went to a nonpartisan election.

Now, the other point about nonpartisan elections — or partisan elections is that means you will elect a partisan Mayor and a partisan County Council. When Lingle Lingle was on the Maui County Council, she was never allowed to run a committee, ever, because she was a Republican. She's a minority. Minority members are shoved off to the side. The — and that's what happens in partisan elections — I mean, partisan setups. That's what happens in the State Legislature, the minority party is put to the side. They don't get to make any substantive changes or laws. So you lose a portion of the people who — who are elected because of the party.

What is the value of that in a nine-member council? And what is the value of -- of partisanship at that level of government? We're talking about water management, we're talking about zoning, we're talking about running a fire department. We're not talking about, you know, the issues going on in Congress. I mean, it's a different level of government, different level of issues.

2

3

4

5

6

7

ጸ

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And to me, these two -- these two facts, the facts that -- the Motor Vehicle Registration Act really did change the registrations. And it's an urban legend that it was because we turned into a nonpartisan government. And -- and the fact that changing our government back into a partisan element -- and I forgot there was one other point I wanted to make, and that was the point I made earlier -- and I gave you statistics to this before -- and that is that 68 percent of the folks who sign up in Maui County to be on boards and commissions declared themselves to be nonpartisan. Now. we're going to tell all these people they have to start declaring their party to be able to take a ballot at the primary now, even though they're not really Democrats or not really Republicans? And where are we going with this and why are we going there?

And I think there's maybe a slight party orientation on this Commission and that is why we're going there. But I don't think this is an appropriate action to take at all given the realities in our society.

Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much,

Commissioner DeLeon.

Commissioners, any further discussion on this?

Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I just have to. I'm not necessarily -- I still, you know, weigh both sides. I would probably be one that would say, on an application, I was nonpartisan because I do tend to vote either way, whether it be I vote for the person, although I am a card-carrying Democrat. But in listening to Dave's argument, it reminds me so much of the district voting. You know, it's like, okay, why do it, why change it. We changed one -- it just seems to be the same kind of issue. What good is it going to do to change it? And -- and maybe there is no good in going back. I'm not saying one way or the other. But it reminds me very much of the district voting issue.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner. MEMBER DELEON: It's my tone of voice that

(Laughter.)

does that.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I know.

vote. And I remember -- I can tell you which

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Sugimura. MEMBER SUGIMURA: I forget which year that this changed for Maui County, but I was working for, I think it was Dennis Nakamura, Councilmember, and I was sitting in Council Chambers when they were taking this

10/10/2011

140

councilmember was the deciding vote, but I won't tell you.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

10/10/2011

141

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa. MEMBER BAXA: I would hope that you would retain it for active discussion. The fact that we are either Republican or Democrat, we should not try to say

that if we are Republican that we're not going to consider the whole picture, the whole benefit of the whole population. And same way when you're Democrats.

Let us consider it, put it in the Active List.

CHAIR STONE: Well, Commissioner Baxa, this is the time to consider it because, after this discussion, we probably will be taking action on whether or not to move forward with it as a proposal. So we need to discuss it now.

MEMBER BAXA: Oh. Discussion?

CHAIR STONE: It is Active List. So do you have further comment now that you know that it's active?

MEMBER BAXA: You know, I am intrigued with

it. I would like to see it come back.

CHAIR STONE: Is there --

MEMBER BAXA: The closed primary.

CHAIR STONE: Just for -- for purposes, what

argument would you have to bring it back?

MEMBER BAXA: I think, in terms of discussion of issues, there will be more discussion of issues when you have Republicans and Democrats before the people.

(Laughter.) MEMBER SUGIMURA: But the interesting part that I remember was I was working as a -- I guess they're called executive assistants now, because we were staff. And we were getting calls from students who said, please change it so that it's nonpartisan. And I can still remember that, that voice that came from our 10 future. It wasn't a lot of students, but they still made the effort to call. And I was pretty impressed 12 with that. And as it turned out, it was changed to nonpartisan. 14 I am a card-carrying, strong campaign-for-everybody Democrat. And I put that on my application, too. And I will always. But, you know, 17 yeah, I'm going to vote the way I vote. It also happens when you pick up your ballot for primary, you get to vote Democrat or Republican for the House and -- and the state and federal side. So you get to vote the way you are. And I don't think we need to change the way that we handle that. CHAIR STONE: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner.

2

3

4

5

6

7

Я

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: In all due respect, Judge

Baxa, I like the nonpartisan approach. I have to agree with Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: How did that happen?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STONE: It's a miracle. Tonya, did you

get that?

MEMBER DE REGO: It's on Akaku now.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: We have the opportunity on

other levels of government, like Yuki Lei said, is declaring our party in voting in the primary. The nonpartisan approach allows a bigger picture for us to have a stronger voice in local government. So I support leaving the nonpartisan approach.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioners, further discussion?

Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Can I make a motion?

CHAIR STONE: Absolutely.

MEMBER DELEON: I would like to remove this

from the Active List.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Do I have a second

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Second.

CHAIR STONE: Who was that? Oh, Commissioner

Crivello.

for the motion?

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. So we have a motion to remove the subject matter nonpartisan elections from

the Active List. Discussion?

MEMBER DELEON: I made my points already.

CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh. Any further?

14 Commissioner Hedani.

> VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Personally, you know, I would support a closed primary system only because when I look at my own personal experience in the last election, when we were looking at the race for Mayor, I almost didn't vote because we had two people from essentially the same party, although you couldn't tell because they didn't say whether they were from that particular party, were running against each other. And to me, it should be clear in terms of who they represent, the ideas that they represent, and the

10/10/2011

144

142

CHAIR STONE: Good. Any further discussion?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: All right. Let's take this to

vote. Lisa, roll call, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: So which is which?

CHAIR STONE: Let me clarify. I'm very sorry.

There is a motion on the floor, and seconded, to remove from the Active List the subject matter nonpartisan elections. Meaning if you vote yes on this -- on our upcoming vote, that we will stay with the present

system.

MEMBER BAXA: I will vote no.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: I vote yes. Wait. Wait.

Clarify.

CHAIR STONE: Yes means stay the same.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: It remains the same. Yeah.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes means stay the same.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: No.

10/10/2011

145

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani.

philosophy going forward.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: No. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger is excused.

Chair Stone

CHAIR STONE: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Six "noes," four "yes."

CHAIR STONE: So we won't be making a proposal on changing the system.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Point of clarification. We will continue to discuss it, it could, in the end, not

become a proposal, correct?

CHAIR STONE: You know, that's a very good question. We need to -- I think --

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Because the motion was to active.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Just keep it.

CHAIR STONE: I believe that, yes, it will

stay on the Active List for now. And we will need to -actually, what would be good is to -- I mean, I think at

this stage -- you know, that is -- let me think about that for a second.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Well, my question — to me, we're narrowing it down each time, but if, in my mind, I only want to see one or two things go actually on the ballot, then I need to know that because I'm going to vote to take most of them off.

CHAIR STONE: I think what could occur at this stage is somebody could make a motion to actually put a proposal to return a closed primary system at this stage, and see where we go with that. And if that is voted yes, then we will work -- the Commission, as a majority, has decided to put it forward. So do I have a motion at this time? Or do we just -- Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I have a question, actually, for Ed. In this particular case, you know, can the Commission just say proposal to return to a closed primary system and that's all we need to do, or do we have to -- does language have to be drafted that would implement something like that?

Analyst.

MR. KUSHI: I'd defer that to your Commission

MO DOOD!

MS. BRODER: I would think that before you propose something to the voters that you have actually

decided exactly what it is that you're proposing. I mean, this is a general concept, but it certainly would need, you know, more fleshing out and more work done before, you know, you would have something that you were ready to propose to the voters. So I think that this would just be -- you know, would be viewed as you voted on a concept, okay, that you want to explore the concept further. And then, you know, if people have -- if Commissioners have more specific ideas about how they want something like that to work, maybe they should, you know, bring it forward. I don't know when or how, what the procedure really would be, but I think that, you know, at this point, it can only be a vote on concept because there isn't anything, you know, about how it's all going to work.

CHAIR STONE: Would you recommend at this stage that we take a vote on concept?

MEMBER OKAMOTO: We just did.

CHAIR STONE: Well, we took a negative vote saying it stays on -- doesn't go off the Active List.

So it just remains on the Active List at this stage.

But it seems like there's a majority --

MEMBER DE REGO: Point of clarification.

CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner De Rego. Oh,

I'm sorry. Commissioner Baxa was asking first. Sorry.

10/10/2011

MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. Go ahead.

MEMBER BAXA: Yeah. I was going to raise a

procedural question here because we just voted no. So are we ongoing what we have just voted?

CHAIR STONE. No no no

CHAIR STONE: No, no, no. We voted to not remove this from the Active List. That's all we voted

MEMBER DE REGO: Now my question of procedure, which follows up, I guess, upon --

MEMBER BAXA: Yeah. The motion was to remove.

CHAIR STONE: And with a no -- no --

MEMBER DELEON: Four for the motion, six

against.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Six people agreed to leave it

on the list.

CHAIR STONE: So six people agreed to leave it

on the Active List.

MEMBER BAXA: The six were the no?

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STONE: I think I heard a joke once like

this.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. Can I --

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner De Rego.

10/10/2011

MEMBER DE REGO: Now can I get my question of clarification? At this point, could somebody make an active motion to have the Legislative Analyst draft a suggested language for a closed primary, proposal for us, or do we hash that out first about exactly what it's supposed to look like, and then ask you to do that?

MS. BRODER: Well, I mean, of course I would prefer to have a little more substance, you know, so that, when I actually get to work, you know, I know what it is that you want to do. I don't want to be inserting myself into what your concept -- you know, what it is that you really want. Do you know what I mean? So I think --

MEMBER DE REGO: So what would be an appropriate motion? I guess that's what I'm asking.

CHAIR STONE: Sorry. Ed has a comment.

MR. KUSHI: Yeah. Just off the top of my head, maybe, procedurally, if the Commission is ready now to move ahead on the question to act on this as part of the Active List, if you say yes, then it's up to us staff to come back with some language. What I would suggest is maybe -- I wasn't -- the previous Charter language -- I don't know what the previous Charter language was before it was changed, but I would imagine

25 you would have to reinsert that.

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BRODER: Well, here's another idea, too, which is that County of Honolulu has a nonpartisan election system. So, I mean, what we could do is we could bring to the next meeting for your consideration, further consideration, is what Honolulu does and what Maui used to do. MEMBER DE REGO: But we already have experience about what we've done. So I don't see the need to bring Honolulu in --MS. BRODER: Okay.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- for something that we've been living with for a while. I think the real question is, is, you know, based on the vote that we just had to leave it on the Active List, whether or not we want to go ahead and draft something. And I think that's the essential question here right now. And who does it and how do we get something that we can actually vote on and move ahead on, either for or against?

CHAIR STONE: Agreed, because this is the first time we've actually been positive on a Active List item. So we just want to make sure procedurally. This is going to set the tone for the rest of our actions, so -- any input, guys? No. Yes, Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah, I think we're at the

stage to make decisions instead of kept -- keep on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

deferring these things.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Either the motion now is going to be to propose it as a amendment or it's not. And that's what the vote should be.

MEMBER DE REGO: Exactly.

I would also say that she already answered the question on Page 4 of her draft, what are the requirements for describing Charter amendments on the ballot. And if you look at the second paragraph, it talks about the text. And the criteria for that is that it must fairly and accurately present the question or issue to be decided in order to assure a free, intelligent and informed vote. While she also does make mention that it can be a summary and what the criteria for that is, it doesn't have to be word for word. But I think we're at the stage. And if we don't start doing something, we're just going to keep this list --

CHAIR STONE: I agree with you totally.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So either there's a proposal to put this on the ballot today and then let them continue to --

> CHAIR STONE: We need a motion. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay.

MEMBER DE REGO: I would like to move, then,

to move this from the Active List to creation of a

10/10/2011

152

you're changing is not only an election system, but it's

10/10/2011

153

also the system of government. So that we'll have partisan government, we might have a Republican Mayor and Democrat Council again, we may have those kind of hassles that we had before on that. That was a consistent problem during the Lingle Administration. Continued in the Arakawa Administration, even though we went to nonpartisan. And we will have minority members in the County Council who will be treated as minority members, and not given leadership functions, like we currently have all members of the County Council with leadership functions. Everybody gets a committee, everybody gets a responsibility. That will change.

I don't understand the value of doing this at this level of government. And I think you guys are missing a serious point here with this. Because you're not just changing the election system, you're changing the nature of the government.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. Further discussion?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: Chair has a statement. I personally am going to vote in favor of this. And one of the reasons is because I think, from my group of people that I discuss politics with, I've noticed there's a very large lack of interest because of people

proposal --CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh. MEMBER DE REGO: - to put as the Charter amendment. Is that the correct motion at this point? CHAIR STONE: So just to clarify, you're putting forward a motion to put forward a proposal to return to a closed primary system. MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. CHAIR STONE: And on the ballot. MEMBER DE REGO: And directing the -- either Corporation Counsel or Legislative Analyst to draft language to that effect. CHAIR STONE: Very good. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Second. CHAIR STONE: It's been seconded -- forwarded and seconded. Discussion? MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair? Oh, go ahead. CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Hedani. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I think information -- if information could be provided on what the prior language was for the closed primary system and when it was changed, it would also help. CHAIR STONE: Very good. Commissioner DeLeon. MEMBER DELEON: I want to point out is what

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

R

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are part of a party and they specifically have beliefs from that party, and, without representation from that party, they just said, forget it, we're not going to vote. So that's the reason I will be voting in favor of this. MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Yeah. It's important to know that we know exactly -- i don't want to be confused now. And I think everybody here understands what we are going to vote on. But I just want to be clear, the proposal is to return to the primary system, closed primary?

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

MEMBER BAXA: Okay. I understand, then. I am clear now.

CHAIR STONE: That is very good. Commissioners, any further discussion?

Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: So going back to where -just a comment with what Dave DeLeon said. In the U.S. Senate, the way that the Democrats and Republicans work, you know, they have like equal vote representation. So if you're the majority party, and you become the chair for the Veteran Affairs, like Senator Akaka was when he

was in the minority party, he was also a chair of -- or vice-chair of some committee. So he was never really -they were never really excluded in terms of having a voice and leadership. It was just that at that -- well, either the party that is of the majority then becomes the chair, and then you have the minority party having the vice-chair position. So there's ways of working it out. I just wanted to throw that out. It's not all that unequal.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Okay. I'm one that I don't belong to any political party. And I'd like the independence of having full representation, that I'm not frowned upon because I'm a card-carrying -- or a non-card-carrying person. So I think, like in your network, you may have people that maybe have this interest of bringing back the closed primary, but there's also a large network that appreciates the nonpartisan because of the process. The process has allowed more open and -- more open government. And that's just my opinion. I support the nonpartisan approach for local government.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Crivello.

And I think we know, more or less, who are the card-carrying representatives, but because they have in mind that it's a full representation, it's like having

10/10/2011

156

the at-large, you know, it's full representation. So I can appreciate and support the fact that we remain nonpartisan.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Point of clarification. Let's say that we pass this one -- we're on our second item -- so we go through the whole thing, and we end up

with 25 items. I don't think anybody wants -- will we go back through again and go, well, this wasn't my most important? Or are we deciding at this point, you know, is this actually my most important what I feel is the

most important? That's where I'm kind of confused.

CHAIR STONE: At this stage, if we put forward -- if we are to take this vote and put this forward, this will go -- we will have the proposal written properly, and that will be taken out to the public for public comment.

Basically, the proposals that we're going to be putting on the ballot are going back to the public. So they're not done. For example, if we go to the public and the public has outrage towards our proposals, we may want to rethink the proposal. So I wouldn't say that it's a done deal because we still are going to be discussing it after our public outreach period.

10/10/2011

157

MEMBER DE REGO: I'm going to reserve. I'm going to let other people go.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: I think he had his hand up.

CHAIR STONE: Oh, Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Just in answer to Kay.

There's also a possibility that presenting the voters with a new Charter, the whole document, rather than -rather than, you know, a laundry list of topics. If we have enough topics and we think they're all serious, we might want to consider doing that.

MEMBER DE REGO: So I'm just -- I just want --

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: I'm sorry. Clifford, do you

want to go ahead?

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Go ahead. You're talking.

MEMBER DE REGO: Since I'm the maker of the

18 motion, I want to be clear about what's happening.

> Okay. My understanding is we're pushing this forward to create language about a amendment that would go onto the

ballot, but it doesn't mean that we've come to the point

that we're actually going to vote that it's actually going to go on the ballot. I'm just talking about

CHAIR STONE: Correct.

creation of language at this point.

.1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER DE REGO: And that we will have another crack at the apple, right, bite at the apple, that will then say whether or not this will actually be one of those proposals that will then make it to the ballot. Am I clear here about that at this point? CHAIR STONE: Yes. Because, remember, we still have our public outreach period. MEMBER DE REGO: Okav. CHAIR STONE: So we have to take these potential proposals to the public. Also, before these potential proposals would go to the public, we need to discuss and make sure we're happy with the language of the proposal.

We're at a new point here. Right? So we do need to clarify and work it out. But this is how I see

If this proposal passes, the language is written for the proposal, it's brought back to us, we review the language, we look at the proposal, we make a motion to take that proposal to the public. Right?

MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. And I feel comfortable, then, with that.

CHAIR STONE: At that stage, it goes to the public, the public has their input on it, then we make, after public input period, the decision if these

proposals are going to go to the ballot -- or to Council.

Commissioner --

MEMBER BAXA: No. I think it's Member

Hashimoto.

CHAIR STONE: Oh. I am so sorry, Cliff. I'm so sorry. Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: For some reason, you hate

(Laughter.)

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Maybe because you and I went to the same school.

CHAIR STONE: Absolutely not true. Absolutely not true. I love you, Cliff. I don't hate you.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: You know, I'd like to go back to what I stated earlier in an early meeting. You know, we've got a lot of these hot little things that we talk about, that seems to generate a lot of interest and whatever. I think -- I think that, you know, the real main question about the Charter is that are we taking care of the right problem.

You know, to me, good government is not really how we elect people. I think it's how the government works, that functions, you know, like how much money does it cost us to run our government. I think -- I

10/10/2011

160

think that's a big thing. And then whether all of the people of the county receive the services that they should receive rather than just going to certain people. You know, I think, to me, those -- those are the things I consider to be important.

And how we go about electing people and all that stuff, you know, I mean, it sounds good on the surface, but it really does nothing, you know. Because you know what's going to happen? We're -- we are going to -- as I stated earlier, we're going to be fooling around with a lot of these things until the point that we cannot actually make any changes. We're going to ends up making perhaps one change, which is not going to do very much, and our government is still going to be the same thing, hasn't changed.

You know what? I think every commission has that same problem. They meet together, they discuss something, and they go on the hottest subject, and they spend all of their time there, and they make no effort there to really look and find -- try to find out what the real problems are in government. And that's -- and that's -- you know, how big is the government, is it effective, and is it just spending money foolishly. Those are, I think, the big problems of government. And -- and not some of these small little things that --

10/10/2011

161

that we spend a lot of time discussing. And we're doing that right now. And it's gonna take a lot of time at the rate we're going. And we're never going to get to the real problem.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Thank you. Commissioner Hashimoto. And by the way, I love you, not hate you. Just so we're clear. That's what I love about you right here. Okay.

Who was up? Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STONE: Sorry.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: You know, for me, right now,

it's -- I'm making my decision on what I think should go to the voters. And along the lines of what Kay had stated earlier, I don't want to see 25 things or 18 things for the voters to have to deal with. I think -in my opinion, I already know what the key issues are and the things that I think are going to need to be addressed to the voters. This is not one of it. I don't recall this being a big issue by the numbers that we heard from. That came through maybe one or two people. And that's just what I recall.

There are a few things, a handful of things, that I think are going to be the key issues. And right now, I'm making that decision as we go through this.

2

3

R

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

best part.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

CHAIR STONE: The good thing is we're not

MEMBER BAXA: Just one word. I want to

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I figured it out. One of

wasting time talking about not wasting time. That's the

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner Hedani.

the questions that I would have if this moves forward

is, if you can come back with answers to if this moves

forward, is, how does a closed primary system not

disenfranchise independent voters? How does an

they do it the same way you do it in the primary

election for the State representative districts, for

instance. You just declare, you take whatever ballot

you want. So you might be an independent, but you only

have two choices, or maybe three choices, it's a green

or libertarian. There isn't independent ballot, but

independent voter draw a ballot, say, in the primary?

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair? CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Del.eon.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Or run for office.

MEMBER DELEON: In an attempt to answer that,

Commissioner Baxa.

proceed with the closed primary.

There will be a couple things like district voting that I'm requesting to be deferred for further information, but, other than that, a lot of these other things, to me, can be dealt with, with the Council proposing amendments. We don't have to be able to do everything just because we heard it.

So I am looking at this list and this process right now, narrowing it down to the things I am going to put my vote to as a final. If it needs more information, if it needs further clarification, then I'm going to say defer it. And if the vote's there, fine; if not, then it doesn't get on there.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I think if we keep this moving, slowly, we're going to just keep regurgitating the thing over and over and over again. Just gotta make a decision and go.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner Moikeha.

Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Well, sir, he was raising his

21 hand. Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Sorry, Commissioner

Hedani.

MEMBER BAXA: I will speak after him.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I lost my train of

165

10/10/2011

there are other ballots. And it's up to the voter to declare himself. It's an open primary in that sense, but -- and it's a party-based primary.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: I just want to clarify why my vote on this issue. I think there's been a consistent train in my thinking about any of these issues, small or large, it has been toward openness and transparency. And for me, this particular issue talks about truth in labeling, especially in terms of political ideology, whether it's at a local level, a state level or a federal level. And for me, this is one of those issues, openness and transparency.

So I will be supporting my own motion at this point based on that.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: So --

CHAIR STONE: Any further -- Commissioner

Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Let me ask a question. Okay. So what Wayne just said about the independent voters, what about the independent candidates, what would their approach be? Do they have to --

MEMBER DE REGO: I'm one of them, actually. I'm -- my issue is I'm not a card-carrying Democrat, I'm

not a card-carrying Republican, but for -- my issue here

10/10/2011

is that political ideology and position actually works in anybody's decisions. I mean, that's a given. That's a fact of life. Okay. And for me, I'd rather know where that person is actually coming from in terms of who they are as a person and -- and their -- their political philosophy from that matter. And then even as an independent, it gives me a chance to be able to make a decision.

of clouds the issue. It may -- but I would go with Wayne in terms of asking Corporation Counsel to clarify what it would mean for independents in terms of either running for office or what their role would be in that.

is a Republican really inform you on what he's going to do as a Mayor and the way it -- way this particular Mayor operates? I mean, how does that relate to the party? I don't see any kind of correlation at all to a party with this Mayor. How does -- do any of you guys know what Mike White is? Is he a Republican or is he a Democrat? I think he used to be a Democrat in the State House, but, heck, he's a corporate leader in a hotel. Wouldn't that make him a Republican? I mean, what's the

I think nonpartisan voting at this point sort

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon. MEMBER DELEON: How does knowing that Arakawa

164

23

25

point of this exercise?

25

What are those labels going to do for us in 2 terms of a better wastewater system or a better bus system or a better finance operation or better parks? I 3 mean, we're talking about County government here. We're 4 5 not talking about, you know, whether we're going to have 6 abortions or not, or whether abortions are illegal, or 7 whether we're going to have trickle down economics, all 8 this stuff that you do at the national and state levels. 9 This is baseline government. This is providing 10 services. Is the trash picked up or isn't it? What 11 difference if it's a R or D? 12 CHAIR STONE: Commissioners, further 13 discussion? VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Call for the question. 14 15 CHAIR STONE: Let's take it to vote. Roll 16 call, please. 17 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Chair, could you restate the 18 motion? CHAIR STONE: Excuse me. The motion is to 19 move forward the proposal to return to a closed primary 20 21 system, for -- to -- would it be Corporation Counsel or 22 to --23 MR. KUSHI: Staff. 24 CHAIR STONE: -- staff to word a proposal, to 25 move forward with the proposal.

MEMBER DELEON: To create a partisan closed 1 2 party system, election system. 3 MEMBER CRIVELLO: Closed primary. MEMBER DELEON: Closed primary. 4 CHAIR STONE: Closed primary. MEMBER HASHIMOTO: (Inaudible) yes or no, make 6 7 it clear. CHAIR STONE: Okay. To make it very clear, R 9 there is a motion to move forward to the proposal 10 stage -- I guess that's what I'm looking for, is what is 11 our next stage in this process. So there's a motion to 12 move forward to the proposal stage the proposal to 13 return to a closed primary election system. 14 Does that make sense? 15 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Move forward to the 16 amendment --17 CHAIR STONE: To the amendment stage. MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair, maybe another way 18 19 of articulating would be to say to take out 13 - I 20 mean, 3.13 to the amendment stage. 21 CHAIR STONE: Yes. Okay. 22 MEMBER DELEON: That item right there. 23 CHAIR STONE: There we go. Okay. So that's 24 how we're going to word it.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Clarification.

10/10/2011

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

168

stage, this is a proposal we are proposing to the voters? Okay. CHAIR STONE: Yes. Okay. So for final

CHAIR STONE: Please.

clarification, there is a motion on the floor, and seconded, to take to the amendment stage the proposal to return to a closed primary system. Everybody happy with that? Commissioner Hedani.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So when you say amendment

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Also, for clarification, it's not 13.13 in the Charter. I think nonpartisanship is talked about at Section 3-2.1.

CHAIR STONE: This is a -- yes. Good point. That's why -- that's why I didn't read it by number. We're going to read it by the proposal. Okay. So is everybody clear before we go to vote? Everybody is clear.

Lisa, roll call.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused.

Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: No.

169

10/10/2011 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto. 1 2 MEMBER HASHIMOTO: No. 3 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. 5 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon. MEMBER DELEON: No. 6 7 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego. 8 MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. 9 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello. 10 MEMBER CRIVELLO: No. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa. 11 12 MEMBER BAXA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Chair Stone. 13 14 CHAIR STONE: Yes. 15 MS. KAHUHU: Six "yes." The motion passes. 16 CHAIR STONE: Okay, the motion passes. This 17 proposal is moved to the amendment stage. 18 Moving forward. Next subject matter, 19 residency requirements. Looking at Proposal Number 3.15 20 and Proposal Number 3.16, proposal for residency 21 requirements for County Council members, proposal to 22 adopt a five-year residency requirement for County Council Members. Discussion? Commissioner Okamoto. 23 24 MEMBER OKAMOTO: We have two parts to this. 25 One, you're talking the length of residency?

Q

CHAIR STONE: And just for clarification, these proposals are ideas. MEMBER OKAMOTO: Right. CHAIR STONE: So if we come up with a different idea, it's in the discussion. MEMBER OKAMOTO: Okay. So one idea has to do with the length of residency. CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh. MEMBER OKAMOTO: How do we take out the interpretation of residency from the County Clerk's Office? I think that's -- I don't know if that is something we need to write in, if there's anything we can do about that. CHAIR STONE: I'll pass that off to staff to answer. MEMBER OKAMOTO: If you recall, in the past election, the County Clerk judged a person to be a resident because they intended to be a resident. MR. KUSHI: Mr. Chair, Members, the Legislative Analyst made reference to a Supreme Court case, recent case. We all know who that was. The case is about 40 pages long. So it's not a simple matter of just putting it in the Charter. It's case law, it's a lot of opinions and lot of factors in determining

issue was whether he could have voted either in Lanai or Lahaina. There's another case pending on the issue of whether he was qualified. I'm not sure where that is. That might be moot because the election is over -- his term of office is over.

But, again, I would hesitate to have you even attempt to make a definition in the Charter and leave it to the courts because that's where it should be cited.

 $\label{eq:MEMBER OKAMOTO:} \textbf{I think that was my question.}$ Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I think the information that our Analyst provided was pretty detailed in Number 3 of Page 2 and 3, that we can set requirements, it appears, given the different counties, that everybody has a -- some have a 90-day preceding the filing, some have two years, some have other terms. But I think your information established that it's a legal thing that you can do, require a certain amount of time for a person to live in that area.

And Ed's shaking his head "no." Am I interpreting that incorrectly?

MR. KUSHI: No, I'm not. Kink in my neck.

MEMBER DE REGO: He's got a kink in his neck.

10/10/2011

 $\label{eq:member_molkeha} \textbf{MEMBER MOlKEHA:} \quad \textbf{Anyways, that's what I read,} \\ \textbf{unless I misread that.}$

MS. BRODER: The only limitation is it has to be something reasonable.

whether or not a person is a resident. I believe that

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Reasonable.

MS. BRODER: It can't be too long. You can

have a reasonable time limit.

MEMBER DELEON: Chair?

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So this is one --

MEMBER DELEON: 1'm sorry.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- that I think is one that

should go to the voters. And we heard a lot of information about residency requirements, particularly from Lanai, and the issues that were raised by citizens and resident voters that had to challenge it in court. And, you know, this is where I think we can do something about strengthening this area of residency.

I'm not sure, at this particular time, how long it should be that a person need to reside in the area before they would be considered a resident. I think it still needs some open discussion.

I would be willing to defer this for further resources and information to come forth so we can determine something reasonable and have that discussion. But I think it's one of the most — one of the most

10/10/2011

important things that I heard from the public.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: I think this thing is really

simple. I think we just say that they have to have voted in the last election in the district and be a resident of the district. If they had voted in the last election in that district, they need to be a resident of the district, and leave it at that. I mean, we can — we can parse things down to nothing, but, I mean, if — if you voted in the last election, that's a matter of record. And — and it's a simple straightforward thing. If you were a registered voter then, you were a registered voter when you file your nomination papers. And the discussion —

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Okay, Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Yeah. In line with --

Mr. Chair, in line with what Commissioner Moikeha said, I'd like to follow on that. Right now, the County Charter of Maui says that a resident of the County of Maui for a period of 90 days preceding the filing of nomination papers, and at the time of filing nomination papers, a resident in the area with whom the person seeks to be elected. This one, as contrasted to the

we may want to consider.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Very good. Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I would have a problem with saying they had to vote in the last election. If they are 19 years old, they are able to now run for office; however, they couldn't have voted in the last election.

I mean, if they voted in the last election, it's like a two-year cycle, but I think the way wording that could create some additional problem. I would like to see longer than 90 days. Maybe two years is realistic. But I think there is a loophole there for a young person to say they had to have voted -- or maybe somebody who was in the hospital the last election and they didn't get to vote, they've lived there for -- you know, just that issue.

MEMBER DELEON: I don't think -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner.
Commissioners, any further discussion?

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: Ma'am, the two years maybe okay, but I think we may run into a problem with that, you know. I mean, the law -- we may be crossing the line by making it the law.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I would be fine with it. So do you think we could make one year? Would that be --

MEMBER BAXA: I really don't know. But the safest that I can see is I don't think anybody has challenged the Charter of the County of Hawaii, 90 days is okay.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: So how do you certify a year,

how do you certify six months, how do you certify any time? We don't even -- you can't even tell whether they live there or not.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: That's right.

MEMBER DELEON: I mean, seriously, that's why I think the voter approach is the best because it's certified. And, okay, so a 19-year-old is going to have to wait for another turnaround. Realistically, a 19-year-old is actually going to get elected?

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I don't know.

MEMBER DELEON: As for somebody -- and as for somebody who is in the hospital, that's why God made,

10/10/2011

you know, the other kind of voting system.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Well, I believe the issue that has come up, he probably did vote on Lanai the previous election. So, you know, I don't know that it's tight enough. That's -- that's just my thoughts.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioners, further discussion? Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I think the residency issue is important from the standpoint of making sure that Lanai and Molokai get adequate representation and from a sense of fairness to those candidates or to those office holders on Lanai and Molokai.

From an informational standpoint, I'd like to know if their travel to and from the island is reimbursable by the County. In other words, if they wanted to go home every night, you know, from the County Council, is that something that they could charge back to the County and it would be reimbursed? Which, to me, would be the fairest way.

CHAIR STONE: Mr. Molina, any insight?

MR. MOLINA: Thank you, Chair. I could give some insight into Commissioner Hedani's inquiry. I believe they do get reimbursed, they're given per diem for travel. However, if the issue was the member would

want to go back every night, he would have to get

10/10/2011

permission from the Council Chair, and depending on the budget. But, in general, I believe the councilmembers from Molokai and Lanai are allowed to go back home at least one day out of the week. So -- and like I said, they are given per diem. And, also, I believe the Hana member is also given per diem as well.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Does that answer your question, Wayne?

MEMBER DELEON: Well, Council Chair is probably --

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: "I'm sorry. Was that once a week?

MR. MOLINA: I believe they are allowed. I could stand -- I could go and get that verified for you from Council Services.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: So they could only be a husband or a wife once a week.

MR. MOLINA: They, basically, want to meet

with their constituents.

MEMBER DE REGO: Their wife or husband, their

MEMBER DE REGO: Their wife or husband, their constituent.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I would like to make a motion

to defer this, keep it on the Active List, and to propose specific information we need. Wayne just asked

2

3

Δ

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 for something, I'd like to know that, also, and if anybody else has other information. But I think it's 2 3 still an issue that needs to be addressed. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Second. 4 CHAIR STONE: A motion has been put forward to 5 defer this subject matter, Residency Requirements, until our next meeting, and it's been seconded by Commissioner 7 Hedani, Discussion? In lieu of further information. 8 9 MEMBER MOIKEHA: I'd like to address that 10 further information now so that --11 CHAIR STONE: Please, go ahead. MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- this doesn't just get 12 13 lost CHAIR STONE: That's fine. 14 15 MEMBER MOIKEHA: So Wayne had one -- one thing 16 to that. I'd really like to know, can the Council function with teleconferencing, so that these members of 17 18 the Council, from Lanai and Hana, Molokai, could remain in their home districts? 19 CHAIR STONE: Is there a Sunshine Law against 20 21 that? 22 MR. MOLINA: You know, it's interesting. 23 Commissioner Moikeha, you brought that up. There had 24 been some talk, discussion, to start using 25 teleconferencing more down the road. But, again, when I

left the Council, it was still being explored, looked into. If you like, I could probably get that information from Council.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah, I'd like to know what status that's at, that conversation here in the County. It's been -- it's been brought up so many times. And it hasn't just been in this context of this Charter Commission. I've heard it so many times prior to that. In fact, could be something by which we would really truly have area representation for these islands that are not part of Maui as far as geographically. But --

And I'm still not certain on the number of days, so I want to think a little bit more about that, unless somebody else has any -- number of days that they have to be a resident of the area before they can file. Whether it's 90 days or two years or three years, I'm uncertain about that.

> CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: So my question is, also, how do you define "lived?" I think that seems to be the problem where some people -- you know, what the term is that you live in the area. Is it that you pay real property tax, is it -- you know, is there a definition that -- or pay rent to somebody, or do you have to, you

10/10/2011

1

know, prove that you do that or something. That seems to be another kind of like a gray area.

here, either by hotel or apartment or something?

10/10/2011

MR. MOLINA: Chairman? Commissioner, yes, as I mentioned earlier, they do have a per diem budget. For example, if I could use Councilmember Carroll as an example, whenever there would be any meetings that would go into the evening, late evening -- I believe we even had one meeting, one budget meeting, went into the early morning -- Councilmember Carroll would stay over at one of the local hotels here, instead of having to make that long drive back to Hana at 1:00 in the morning. So there was monies provided for him, as well as for any other councilmembers that come from the remote areas.

CHAIR STONE: Good. Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: The other question would be so it's the Council clerk -- it's the clerk that determines whether they're valid to run in that area, is that correct? What determines -- what department

MR. MOLINA: County Clerk.

determines that?

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay. Can we have that person here, also, when that comes up? Because I'd like to know how -- exactly what Yuki Lei said, what is the defining of the word "live." I want to know what their standard is of determining whether or not someone actually lives in that area and is valid to run. So if they could be here to answer that kind of questions.

2 3 CHAIR STONE: Okay. Commissioner --MEMBER DELEON: DeLeon. 4 5 CHAIR STONE: -- DeLeon. How could I forget? MEMBER DELEON: I don't know. I tried to 6 7 (inaudible) into your head. 8 MEMBER DE REGO: He needs a new --MEMBER DELEON: My question, is the clerk able 9 10 to identify voters having voted in the last election? 11 So that if you voted, say, in 2010, can the clerk 12 actually identify that? 13 CHAIR STONE: Are you asking --14 MEMBER DELEON: That's to staff, however that 15 goes. That's a question to staff. I thought we were 16 collecting questions. 17 CHAIR STONE: We are. 18 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah. 19 CHAIR STONE: Yes, we are. 20 Commissioner Hedani. 21 MR. KUSHI: The other question that I would 22 have on this issue is if they cannot commute on a daily 23 basis back home, is there a provision for reimbursement 24 to them for housing expenses while they're overnight 25

10/10/2011 CHAIR STONE: Good. Next meeting. 1 2 Commissioner Hashimoto. MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yeah. Not being a lawyer 3 or judge or anything, I have a problem with a lot of 4 5 those questions that have to do with Sunshine Law and whether the thing is going to be challenged or not. You 6 know, I think it's -- it behooves us to move along changes or additions, or whatever we do, or amendments 8 9 of the Charter that is beneficial to the people of our 10 County, and not worry about whether it's going to be 11 challenged or not. Let the -- let somebody challenge 12 it. That's what I say. Otherwise, they should make this -- the Commission should be made up of lawyers and 13 14 judges. 15 MEMBER DELEON: We got one of them. 16 MEMBER HASHIMOTO: I thought -- I thought that 17 we were supposed to represent the -- the average person 18 in the community. Isn't that what - I think it's what 19 it says somewhere. But -- but somehow if -- we're not 20 lawyers, so, you know, how do we make some of these 21 defining -- answer some of these defining questions 22 without being lawyers or judges? So what I think is, is 23 that whatever amendment we choose to make, or put before 24 the -- the people, we go right ahead and do it and let 25 them challenge. Who cares? That's what the judges are 10/10/2011 MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. 1 2 3 MEMBER HASHIMOTO: No. 4 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. 5 6 7 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. 8 9 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes.

there to do. CHAIR STONE: Again, that's what I love about you, Cliff. Thanks very much. So we have a motion on the floor. Is there any further discussion, or bring out any further VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Call for the question. MEMBER DELEON: What is the question again? CHAIR STONE: The question is to defer the subject matter residency requirements --MEMBER DELEON: Okay. CHAIR STONE: -- in lieu of the information just requested. Any further discussion? (No Response.) CHAIR STONE: So, Lisa, let's take that to MS. KAHUHU: Member Baxa. MEMBER BAXA: The issue is to defer? CHAIR STONE: Yes. MEMBER BAXA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Member Crivello. MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Member DeLeon.

184

MS. KAHUHU: Member Hashimoto. MS. KAHUHU: Member Hedani. MS. KAHUHU: Member Moikeha. MS. KAHUHU: Member Okamoto. MS. KAHUHU: Member Sugimura. 10 MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes. 11 MS. KAHUHU: Member Wiger, excused. 12 13 Chair Stone. CHAIR STONE: Yes. 14 MS. KAHUHU: Nine "yes." Motion passes. 15 16 CHAIR STONE: Okay. This subject matter, 17 residency requirements, will be deferred to our next meeting. 18 19 MEMBER DELEON: Chair? CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner DeLeon. 20 21 MEMBER DELEON: Point of order. You know, it 22 might be expeditious if we just take general votes 23 rather than do roll call for every item, especially when 24 it's fairly obvious that something is going to be 25 approved.

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

185

CHAIR STONE: Very good. I think when we're discussing deferral, then, yes, but if we're discussing proposals moving forward, then roll call. MEMBER DELEON: All right. CHAIR STONE: All right. Very good. Next subject matter, term limits. And there have been a number of proposals. Why doesn't everybody take two or three moments, please, to read through the proposals put forward? Actually, that is a good point. Yes. I think we should take a break here, 10-minute break. I'm going to call a recess, returning at 2:45. (Recess, 2:36 p.m. t 2:48 p.m.) CHAIR STONE: Let's call this meeting back from recess, 2:50. And moving on to our next subject matter, term limits. Discussion? MEMBER DE REGO: Mr. Chair? CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner De Rego. MEMBER DE REGO: I would actually like to see this pushed along as quickly as possible in terms of a proposal. So I'm going to start off the conversation

first by saying that I personally would like to see a

extension of the Council terms, but, also, see the terms

be absolute in a sense of, whether they're consecutive

or not, pushing forward that there would be three terms

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

of four years and those terms would be absolute. There's no second bite at the apple, whether -- whether they're consecutive or not. Now, that being said, I would also like a consideration of how we sort of, in the transitional presently serving on the Council. Whether that's

position -- provisions, back in this into those who are possible, whether it's constitutional, I think, needs to be looked at. I think we've heard enough on this from all sectors to say that there needs to be a transition to people who have new ideas, to people who would have a chance to serve the community and the County in ways that we don't see a -- how can I say -- well, I'll just leave it at that.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Second.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner, that was a motion.

correct?

MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. That was a pretty long motion, but I -- let me shorten it, okay? Okay. I would make a motion to write up --

CHAIR STONE: Amendments, we'll call it.

Amendment stage.

MEMBER DE REGO: To take to the amendment

stage a three-year --

CHAIR STONE: Term.

2 four-year term limit, absolute, and with transitional 3 provisions related to currently serving councilmembers. 4 CHAIR STONE: Thank you. And we have a 5 second --MEMBER MOIKEHA: Second. 6 CHAIR STONE: -- from Commissioner Moikeha. 7 8 Discussion? Commissioner DeLeon. 9 MEMBER DELEON: Can we make it staggered as 10 well? MEMBER DE REGO: And staggered. Okay. I take 11 12 that as a friendly amendment. 13 CHAIR STONE: So amended, Commissioner 14 Crivello. 15 MEMBER CRIVELLO: I have a question to your motion with the existing Council. Because this goes --16 17 if it does go on the ballot, it goes to the people in 18 2012. 19 MEMBER DE REGO: Yeah. MEMBER CRIVELLO: So does that allow the 20 21 existing council people to -- how do you make that 22 transitional? 23 24

MEMBER DE REGO: Well, this is something I would like the Legislative Analyst to figure out and --

MEMBER DE REGO: I mean a three-term.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: I mean, because --

10/10/2011

188

MEMBER DE REGO: -- come back to us. MEMBER CRIVELLO: If their term is up, how does it become transitional if this is not in effect?

MEMBER DE REGO: Yeah. I understand your problem. And that's where the Constitutional problems may come in, or the challenge, I think. For those who's already served their 10 years, you know, does this actually apply to them. So I understand that is a problem. For those who are currently serving, I think it would be easier because, you know, they're in for eight years already, we could probably say that's two terms done and then, boom, you got one more shot at the apple and then done. For those who are leaving, I think that would be a problem. So I do admit that, but that's something that, hopefully, our Legislative Analyst and the Corporation Counsel will give us some answers whether or not that's possible.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah. I would support this proposal. The transition, I can see utilizing the current terms, lengths that are in there now and applying it towards the 12 max as part of the transition, for those that are candidates already in

10/10/2011

25

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

189

the end of 2012, whether or not they could come back under a new amendment. And I'm not quite certain, either, how to deal with that. It's almost like wiping the slate clean for them, and they could enter the race at any time in the next 12 unless you prohibit that. So that would be my question, also, to the Analyst.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes. My question, Chair, is, are we going to go through all those different --

CHAIR STONE: No.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: -- things? Is this the

only one that we're going to vote on?

CHAIR STONE: Yes. This is what we're -- it's on the table at the moment. So this is what we're discussing. If you disagree --

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: So the rest of them just are disregarded?

CHAIR STONE: Well, they're built into this thought process. So if you want to bring something

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: So once we take a vote, we're going on to the next?

CHAIR STONE: Exactly. Very good.

Commissioner Okamoto.

1

2 3

16 17 18

19

20

15

21 22 23

24 25

office. It's going to only affect two individuals at

10/10/2011

191

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I would like to see the 1 2 motion split. I am -- I've heard too many people who want to keep the two-year term. And I heard -- I know 3 that it has been voted on before and it's gotten -- the 4 four years got voted down. I do agree with the absolute 5 term limits, but I can't support this because I do feel 6 that the two-year term is what I've heard a lot of 8 people say. CHAIR STONE: If this motion fails, then I ٩ 10 believe you can place another motion forward. Commissioners, any further discussion? 11 12 (No Response.) 13 CHAIR STONE: No further discussion --14 MR. KUSHI: Mr. Chair? 15 CHAIR STONE: Yes. MR. KUSHI: Clarification on the motion for 16 staff. Four-year Council term and three term max, which 17 18 is 12 years? 19 CHAIR STONE: Right, correct. 20 MR. KUSHI: Three term max, whether it be 21 consecutive or split? 22 CHAIR STONE: I believe that was the motion. 23 MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. 24 CHAIR STONE: Yes, correct. 25 MR. KUSHI: You can run for four years, take a

1 break, come back for another two four-year terms? MEMBER DE REGO: Yeah. 2 CHAIR STONE: Staggered and with transitional 3 4 language. Do you guys need me to reread it? I'm sorry. 5 Commissioner Sugimura. MEMBER SUGIMURA: So is this going to -- is 6 7 this sort of close to what the Mayor proposed, then? 8 Which is his -- his proposal, when he presented to us, 9 was talking about initial term of office for two-year 10 term to a four-year term, stagger the terms by 11 implementing the first election, the highest vote 12 getters -- he addressed that, how you transition people 13 in, who will serve four-year terms, the next highest 14 vote getters will serve two-year terms, dah, dah, dah, 15 dah, dah. Is that off? That's 3.22. 16 CHAIR STONE: I don't believe this is directly 17 from the Mayor's proposal. This is from Frank De Rego. 18 MEMBER DE REGO: That portion is not mine. I 19 think mine was closer to the 3.21. But, yes, I think 20 that was the Mayor's proposal in terms of how to 21 transition into this. 22 CHAIR STONE: So that transitional language 23 could work into the --24 MEMBER DE REGO: Could possibly work into. 25 CHAIR STONE: Possibly.

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

192

MEMBER DE REGO: Yeah, depending on what the Legislative Analyst and Corporation Counsel come up

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair, the State is actually doing something -- the State Reapportionment Commission is actually doing something like that right now with the State Senate. They're wrestling with who is going to get the -- have to serve a two-year term and then run again, and then who is going to get the full four-year term. So that is something that needs to be addressed, otherwise you have --

MEMBER DE REGO: Exactly.

MEMBER DELEON: -- the whole Council elected simultaneously, then you have confusion about that continuity.

CHAIR STONE: Okay, Great, So any further discussion?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: Okay. The motion is, correct me if I'm wrong, Frank, to move to the amendment stage, proposal to go to four-year terms with a three-term maximum, which is a total of 12 years, with no extension, that includes transitional language and is staggered in implementation.

MEMBER DE REGO: And they're absolute. It

193

10/10/2011 1 doesn't have to be -- they're not consecutive. 2 CHAIR STONE: Right. Right. Is that 3 understood? 4 MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair? CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner Baxa. 5 6 MEMBER BAXA: Point of inquiry. Should this 7 -- should we vote on this, does that mean that we cannot 8 make any other proposal? 9 CHAIR STONE: This is the -- this is for --10 this proposal is for the subject matter term limits. So 11 this is going to be the term limit proposal. If there's 12 -- if there is a discussion, please bring it forward 13 now, if you disagree with anything. 14 MEMBER BAXA: I would disagree because I would 15 like to propose another proposal which would be two-year 16 term for -- two-year term, five times, absolute, 10 17 18 CHAIR STONE: Okay. There's a proposal on the 19 table. So if this proposal were to fail, I think then 20 we would move to that proposal. 21 Further discussion? 22 MEMBER DE REGO: Can I speak to the motion 23 again, then, Chair? 24 CHAIR STONE: Yes.

MEMBER DE REGO: I think we also heard from a

10/10/2011

lot of people, not only in the Administration, but others, who see the value of the four-year term. I think this works hand in hand in terms of biennial budget. I think it works in hand with the whole idea of the Office of the Auditor. I think it works hand in hand in terms of we're always doing strategic planning followed by an election, and we never give our council people enough time to, you know, get out of the box and be able to do some longer range planning in regards to some of the issues that are fading – facing the County.

I know this has been a measure that has been constantly voted down by the public, but I think part of that has been education about the nature of government and how we operate at this point. I think once it makes the amendment stage, I think there needs to be an education in terms of how these kinds of proposals actually work hand in hand with one another. And I think that's going to be, you know, the issue here.

So that's my -- my two cents about this

CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner De Rego.

MR. KUSHI: Recess, Chair, one minute?
CHAIR STONE: We need to take a very short

recess, two minutes.

(Recess, 2:59 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.)

MEMBER DELEON: Are we on the record yet?

CHAIR STONE: No, we're not. I need to bring our meeting back in session. Cliff, thank you very much, I understand that, but we are on to discussing subject -- the full subject matter. And the proposals that come forward may not necessarily be any one of these individual proposals, but a proposal formulated.

Now, Corporation Counsel informed me that the process should be that if Commissioners have an amendment to the proposal, they can put it forward, and, if it is seconded, then we have to take a vote on the amendment to the proposal. So, I'm sorry, I should not have cut you guys off. If you -- Commissioner Okamoto and Commissioner Baxa expressed interest in doing a two-year term instead, you guys can put that motion forward, to amend, to amend the motion on the table, and if it's seconded, then we have discussion and we can vote. And if that amendment holds, then it stands and we move forward. All right? So that's the process.

All right. So with that said, Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Is this Proposal 3.18, 3.21, or none of the above?

MEMBER DE REGO: Well, I thought when we were

-- okay. This is my understanding of the process we're

10/10/2011

doing right now. We decided to discuss these as a group.

CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh.

MEMBER DE REGO: And I thought that it might be best to make a recommendation that took the best of a couple of proposals and put them into a recommendation, which meant having a long enough period for representatives to be in office, long enough term to be able to do long-range, as well as strategic planning for the County, and last but not least, also have some transitional provisions included within the recommendation and the language that would include present members of the Council.

10/10/2011

working on. These are general subject matters, these proposals are meant for us to review and come up with our own ideas, or, if one is perfect, put that forward. So the process is working correctly. So now if there are people, Commissioners, I heard from that prefer a two year, if you like to put forward an amendment to the proposal.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I personally wouldn't amend it. I think it really becomes kind of a different proposal. So I would go with what your originally said. If it is voted down, then I would put up a new proposal. Because it gets a little confusing, I think, to just -- on this particular issue.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Some issues, yes. CHAIR STONE: Okay. Very good.

Any further discussion?

(No Response.)

 $\label{eq:CHAIR STONE: Let's put it to vote. Roll call, please.}$

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused.

Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: No.

recommendation and the language that would include present members of the Council.

So as we -- this is -- please correct me if I'm wrong, and if I'm out of order in this, as we're discussing these in general, right -
CHAIR STONE: No. That is correct, Frank.

MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. I was seeing a way of crafting several of these ideas into one. Of course, I have a penchant more for four-year terms than two-year terms. And, you know, people can vote the motion up and down, or amend it as they want, but I wanted to put something before the table. I'd like to see us move these things along.

CHAIR STONE: This is the process we should be

10/10/2011

198

10/10/2011

199

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha. 1 2 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto. 3 CHAIR STONE: Cliff? 4 5 MEMBER HASHIMOTO: No. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani. 6 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. MS, KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon. 8 9 MEMBER DELEON: Yes. 10 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego. 11 MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello. 12 MEMBER CRIVELLO: No. 13 14 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa. 15 MEMBER BAXA: No. 16 MS. KAHUHU: Chair Stone. CHAIR STONE: Yes. 17 18 MS. KAHUHU: Six "yes." Motion passes. 19 CHAIR STONE: Motion passes. The proposal 20 goes to the amendment stage. 21 Moving on, next item, subject matter, Council 22 Powers. There's only one proposal for this subject 23 matter, Number 3.33, proposal to amend Section 3-6, 24 Powers of the Council, to require that the Council 25 approve the appointments of all department heads. In

2 appointments of the Planning Department and the Director 3 of the Department of Finance. Discussion? Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: I'm not in support of 5 6 changing this at this time. I think this is something 7 that the Mayor or the -- can work on, or the Council can propose as an amendment. So I'm not going to support 8 any kind of motion to move this forward. 9 10 CHAIR STONE: Thank you. 11 Commissioner De Rego. 12 MEMBER DE REGO: I would say the same thing. I'm still having a problem focusing on the Planning 13 Director instead of the Managing Director, who's 14 15 actually second in line to the Mayor, and not being 16 involved in this process somehow in terms of being 17 approved by the Council. So I think this is something 18 that we could move that maybe the Council could handle 19 it, but I would agree with Commissioner Moikeha. 20

the alternative, require that the Council approve the

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioners, further discussion? VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Just a question.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: If this proposal were to

pass, does that mean that directors of departments like

10/10/2011

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

200

the Police Chief would need to be approved by the Council after the Commission has voted?

CHAIR STONE: You're asking the wrong guy. Hang on one second. Sherry, what would that -- could you define that?

MS. BRODER: Well, it's -- it's not my proposal, so I'm not 100 percent sure what the intent was, but it does seem, based on your question, that the answer would be yes. I mean, it seems like the intent is all department heads, or, in the alternative, then just those two.

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: It seems like we have two

different items here.

MEMBER DE REGO: Yes.

MEMBER DELEON: We're not talking about one

item. We're talking about one that talks about all department heads, and we have another one that's only

talking about Finance and the Planning Director.

Finance is -- the argument can be made that he's third

in line of succession, that the Council needs to approve

that. But I don't see -- again, Managing Director is

second in line. So, I mean, why are we missing that

one?

10/10/2011

21

22

23

24

25

24

25

201

MEMBER DE REGO: Exactly. 2 MEMBER DELEON: And Planning Director, I mean, 3 why not the Public Works Director or Parks Director? I 4 mean, where's that stuff? 5 CHAIR STONE: Further discussion? MEMBER DELEON: (Inaudible.) 6 7 CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you. 8 Further discussion? 9 MEMBER BAXA: Yeah, Mr. Chair. CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa. 10 11 MEMBER BAXA: It looks like there is really 12 confusion here, though. 3.3, proposal to amend 3.6, Powers of the Council, to require that councilmembers --13 14 Council approve the appointment of all department heads. 15 That is all department heads. The second one, in the 16 alternative, require the Council to approve the 17 appointments of the Planning Director and the Director 18 of Finance. Right now, the Corporation Counsel, the Department of the Prosecuting Attorney are also approved 19 20 by the Council. So what does that mean? Are they taken 21 out of the process? 22 CHAIR STONE: I'll pass that off to our 23

Analyst.

MS. BRODER: What do you mean, are they taken out of the process?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

q

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1 2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER BAXA: Yeah, because the alternatives say it limits it only to the Planning Director and the Director of Finance.

MS. BRODER: Yeah. So are you saying if that -- I think it can be however you want it, you know. ! mean, you don't have to be bound by this. So if you wanted to have it every department head, if you wanted to have it department head X, Y and Z, or A, B and C, or however you wanted to change the Charter, so specific department heads would have to be approved by the Council Chair.

MEMBER DE REGO: Mr. Chair? CHAIR STONE: Commissioner De Rego. MEMBER DE REGO: I think, if I remember the context of this particular proposal, after reading through them all, was that this was going to be in addition to the other department heads that were, you know, approved by the Council. It wasn't something that kind of sat up there in the ethereal heaven, that, all of a sudden, everything else goes by the wayside. But I think this was in addition to the -- you know, what goes

> CHAIR STONE: Very good. Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Maybe we should ask for,

you know, a motion either for or against this particular motion so we can actually --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I'll put it forth. I say leave it alone and move on.

MEMBER DELEON: Second.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I don't see any reason to explore this.

CHAIR STONE: Okay.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: It's something that the

Council can do themselves.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Commissioner Moikeha has put forward a motion to move the Subject Matter, Council Powers off of the Active List, it has been seconded by Commissioner DeLeon. Any further discussion on that? (No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. So, actually, by a show of hands, all in favor of moving this off the Active List, raise your hands, please. I believe that is all except for Commissioner Baxa.

> MEMBER BAXA: Wait. Wait. CHAIR STONE: So that's unanimous.

MEMBER BAXA: I have to be clear as to what

I'm voting for now.

CHAIR STONE: Oh. To, basically, not -- to remove this subject matter off of the Active List.

10/10/2011

on right now. So --

204

MEMBER BAXA: Okay. I go with that. CHAIR STONE: Okay. So, again, show of hands, please, all in favor. Okay. It's unanimous. Wow.

Very good. Moving on, Subject Matter,

Structure of Office of the Executive.

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: This is something that I have always been very interested in. And I think, at some time in the future, could really, really benefit this County. I don't think we have the time to explore it. I think it needs -- although I've heard a little bit of support for it, and, also, from the Mayor, proposed it, I think this is something that needs a lot of homework done. I would like -- I would hope that the Administration right now would start to explore this and start to form some kind of committees to look into it. and prepare for that day. Because I think once this happens, it's going to change the entire Charter. And I just don't think we have the time or the resources to really delve into this. So I'm -- I support this and I'd like to see it happen one day in my lifetime, but I don't think it's going to happen this time around.

> CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: I agree with Commissioner

10/10/2011

205

Moikeha on this item. However, as proposed earlier, I would like to see a commission formed that would take this into -- into another realm. This Commission, of course, doesn't have the time to try to deal with this. Our community is not ready to have this conversation, because we have no experience with this form of government. But the experience around the country is that this works, it's an efficient form. And Maui News wrote an editorial in opposition to this based on the way this thing is written.

I'm not talking about a ceremonial mayor, I'm talking about the kind of mayor that the Mayor Arakawa spoke about, which is a -- the Chair of the County Council would be Mayor and that would be the oversight body for Administration that would be a professional Administration. But we're not ready for that conversation. We're not ready to push it out of here. But I agree with Susan that this is an important issue that would have real relevance and that should be studied as a forward thinking community should be doing, looking at all forms out there to improve its efficiency and function.

And I want to point out that we lost three mayors in a row to elections. I mean, three incumbent mayors were defeated. That kind of speaks to a

25

24

25

leadership issue. And I think -- I think that's -that's relevant enough -- I mean, relevancy enough to be able to make the argument we should have as a Commission.

> CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: I want to agree with everything that's been said here. I just had a conversation with the Mayor last night, actually said to him, in Zippy's, that there needs to be a blue ribbon commission or some kind of organization that actually looks at these issues. At least -- I know we're discussing at some point, you know, 18 months for the Charter Commission, but this is the kind of an issue -since you're actually asking for a wholesale change in the Charter, you're actually asking for a complete new Charter, that this -- this be looked at, at least three years out, at minimum, in terms of making a change of government, something like this, and to investigate all the implications of what that means.

So we just don't have the time or the ability at this point to deal with it, but I do think -- and I keep asking if we have the ability to make recommendations at the end, little spiritual nosegays or whatever into the Council, saying maybe this is

something the Mayor can think about doing, even though 2 we weren't able to deal with it. So --3 CHAIR STONE: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Okamoto. MEMBER OKAMOTO: I move that we take this off 5 the Active List. I don't know if it's possible to make 6 7 recommendations, but I think we have to take it off of 8 our Active List. 9 CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you. Do I have a 10 second? 11 MEMBER DE REGO: Second. 12 MEMBER SUGIMURA: Second. MEMBER CRIVELLO: Second. 13 14 CHAIR STONE: Oh. Okav. Who shot first. 15 guys? 16 MEMBER DE REGO: The birthday boy. CHAIR STONE: We'll give that one to 17 18 Commissioner Crivello because she's closest. 19 (Laughter.) 20 CHAIR STONE: All right. The motion is to 21 move Subject Matter, Structure of Office of the 22 Executive off of the Active List. Any further 23 discussion on that? 24 (No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. By a show of hands, all in

10/10/2011

1

2

21

22

23

24

25

208

3 That's off the subject list -- Active List. Excuse me. Moving on, Article 8, County Departments. 5 Chapter 1, Department of Management, Proposal Number 6 8.1.1, proposal to amend Section 8-1.1, Organization, to 7 specify that there shall be a Deputy Managing Director. 8 MEMBER OKAMOTO: I move that we take this off the Active List. 10 CHAIR STONE: There's a motion. 11 MEMBER CRIVELLO: I second. 12 CHAIR STONE: And seconded by Commissioner 13 Crivello. Discussion? Commissioner Sugimura. 14 MEMBER SUGIMURA: You want to speak? 15 CHAIR STONE: I'm sorry. Yes. MEMBER OKAMOTO: Well. I think this is not one 16 17 of the issues that I feel is important enough, and this 18 is something that the Council could handle or the Mayor 19 can handle. 20 CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioner Sugimura.

would the Mayor present it? Maybe Mike has a --

this something that can just be done? Otherwise, why

CHAIR STONE: Mr. Molina.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: That was my question. Is

favor of moving this off the list, say "aye" -- or show

hands. Sorry. "Aye" and show hands. Okay, unanimous.

209

10/10/2011 MR. MOLINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In 1 2 response to Commissioner Sugimura's inquiry, I would 3 like to add it's been expressed to me recently by the Administration that they will probably forego this, so 5 it's not something they're going to push. So I can 6 safely say it would be okay to go ahead and defer this 7 or put this on the inactive list. 8 CHAIR STONE: Okay. Any further discussion 9 before we go to vote? 10 (No Response.) CHAIR STONE: No further discussion. By show 11 12 of hands, all in favor of moving this to the - off the 13 Active List, raise your hands. Unanimous, off the 14 Active List. 15 Moving forward. Chapter 3 of Article 8, Department of Prosecuting Attorney. Number 8.3.1 --16 17 well, there's multiple proposals. So go ahead and take 18 a second, read those proposals, please. MEMBER SUGIMURA: This came from them, though? 19 20 MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair, they're proposed to 21 be proposed. They're not exclusive to each other. 22 CHAIR STONE: Oh, okay. 23 MEMBER DE REGO: Yeah. I would move --

MEMBER DELEON: That was housekeeping.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- Mr. Chair, that -- I would

10/10/2011

agree with professor -- professor -- I just made you 1 2 reverend professor there, Dave. 3 (Laughter.) MEMBER DE REGO: I feel like I'm in an 4 5 academic setting. Yes, to be back. I would propose that we move this to the amendment stage, both of these, 6 since these were housekeeping. And I think that it was 8 pretty well accepted by the rest of the Commission that 9 we move both of these to the amendment stage. 10 CHAIR STONE: Do we have a second? MEMBER SUGIMURA: Second. 11 12 CHAIR STONE: So a motion is on the floor to 13 move to the amendment stage Proposal Number 8.3.1 and Proposal Number 8.3.2, and it's been seconded. Any 14 15 discussion? 16 (Laughter.) CHAIR STONE: Okay. Since this is moving it 17 to -- moving it forward, I would like to do roll call 18 19 for this one. 20 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa. MEMBER BAXA: Yes. 21 22 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello. 23 MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes. 24 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon. MEMBER DELEON: Yes.

1 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego. 2 MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. 3 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto. MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes. 4 5 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. 6 7 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. 8 9 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto. 10 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes. 11 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Sugimura. 12 MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes. 13 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused. Chair Stone 14 15 CHAIR STONE: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Unanimous. Motion passes. 16 17 CHAIR STONE: Very good. Both of those 18 proposals move forward to the amendment stage. 19 MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair, an observation. 20 Notice how we go quicker at the end of the clock? 21 CHAIR STONE: Fatigue is a wonderful thing. 22 It's amazing. 23 Chapter 7, Department of Fire and Public 24 Safety. 25 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Mr. Chair?

10/10/2011

25

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

212

MEMBER OKAMOTO: -- table Department of Fire and Safety until the next meeting since we've already said we would ask the Chief back at that time. And there's a lot of things on that one. CHAIR STONE: Call Fire Chief.

CHAIR STONE: Yes --

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I move that we --

CHAIR STONE: -- Commissioner.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: I second.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. A motion's been put forward and seconded to defer Chapter 7, Department of Fire and Public Safety to the next meeting. Discussion? Commissioner Moikeha.

need to be specific of what we're asking resource people. So I need time to think about that. Can we just email that to Lisa, our question -- our concerns? CHAIR STONE: Very good. Any questions or concerns send to Lisa and Ed.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I think this is one where we

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair? I have a --CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: On 8.7.2, the first item has

-- well, both items speak to removal. The proposal was to -- for the Mayor to approve the nomination of the chief and have the -- have the ability to request the

10/10/2011

213 1 removal. It wasn't -- it wasn't just to remove: it was 2 also to hire -- or to approve a nomination from the commission. 3 MEMBER CRIVELLO: That's 8.7.2, Page 5. 5 MR. KUSHI: Don't forget the ones you just 6 voted on, too. 7 CHAIR STONE: Yeah, there's further items 8 being added. MS. BRODER: Yeah. 10 CHAIR STONE: Very good. MEMBER DELEON: That was my proposal, so I --11 12 CHAIR STONE: Did you get that, Sherry? MS. BRODER: Could you repeat that? I'm 13 14 sorry. 15 MEMBER DELEON: The proposal was -- that was 16 the conversation I was having with the testifier at the 17 beginning of the meeting. And that is that the 18 commission does the recruitment and vetting and 19 nomination of the chief, with the final approval by the 20 Mayor. 21 MS. BRODER: Okay. Which one is that? 22 CHAIR STONE: 8.7.3. 23 MEMBER DELEON: 2, 1 think. 24 CHAIR STONE: Well, 8-7.2. 25 MEMBER DELEON: That's confusing because you

1 get the next one. 2 MS. BRODER: Okay. Number 8.7.2, to amend 3 8.7.3? MEMBER DELEON: Got it. MS. BRODER: Okay. 5 CHAIR STONE: Okay, good. Any discussion on 6 deferring this? 8 (No Response.) 9 CHAIR STONE: No discussion. By show of 10 hands, in all in favor of deferring this to the next 11 meeting, raise your hands. Guys? Okay. Dave, are you 12 votina? 13 MEMBER DELEON: Sorry. 14 CHAIR STONE: Unanimous decision to defer. 15 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Point of information. This 16 is until the next meeting? 17 CHAIR STONE: Next meeting. 18 Just to put a little bit of Halloween scare in 19 you, we have three meetings remaining before we go back 20 to the public. Yeah, so let's continue. Yeah. MEMBER DELEON: All right, Water Supply. 21 22 CHAIR STONE: We're on Page 7, yes. Moving 23 forward. Page 7, Subject Matter, Housekeeping, Chapter 24 9, Department of Personnel Services. Proposal Number 25 8.9.1, proposal to amend Article 8, County Departments,

Chapter 9, Department of Personnel Services, Section 1 2 9.4 --3 MEMBER DELEON: Move to approve. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Second. 5 CHAIR STONE: We have a motion to approve this 6 housekeeping measure, seconded by Commissioner Hedani. 7 Discussion? 8 (No Response.) 9 CHAIR STONE: Okay. So putting it forward. 10 this is a motion to move this proposal to our amendment 11 stage -- moving this proposal to the amendment stage. 12 Discussion? 13 MEMBER DE REGO: Call for the question, 14 Mr. Chair. 15 CHAIR STONE: Oh. Yeah, you got it. 16 MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. Are we going to vote? 17 CHAIR STONE: Roll call, please. Sorry, 18 Frank. I'm like, "What question?" 19 MEMBER MOIKEHA: I think this is one of 20 those --21 MEMBER DE REGO: We can raise our hand. 22 CHAIR STONE: All right. All in favor, raise 23 their hand. It's unanimous, Proposal Number 8.9.1 moves 24 to the amendment stage. 25 Moving forward, subject matter Water Supply

10/10/2011

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

216

Department and Board, Chapter 11, Department of Water Supply. And I would prefer not to defer.

Yes, Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I'm going to put forth a motion to take this off the list. I think this is another subject matter that I can't even envision myself wrapping my head around. That's just my personal opinion, but I'm going to throw it out there to take it

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Second.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Council can take it up if

they wish.

CHAIR STONE: There's a motion to remove this proposal from the Active List, and seconded by Commissioner Hedani. Discussion? Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: I do have a concern about leaving this as is. That is, this is the reason why we had Fire Department -- the Fire Chief being appointed by the Fire Commission. Fire Commission didn't have anything to do for 20 years and, eventually, managed to convince a Charter Commission to give them the power to hire and fire -- hire and fire the Fire Chief. Okay. Because you have a commission not doing anything,

they're going to sit there, and it's going to fester. So we're going to have a Board of Water Supply in this 10/10/2011

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

217

case festering with not any real responsibility. The real Board of Water Supply will be the County Council. And so you'll have this body sitting there with not really a good function.

And, typically, in these cases, we have had experience of this in the past, the director will ignore the Board of Water Supply. I mean, that is just the reality. He's got one board he's got to listen to, and that is the County Council. This is just a redundancy.

And so my suggestion is that, instead of being a Board of Water Supply, that we turn this into a Board of Water Appeals. There needs to be an appeal body for the director's decisions. And the ability to get water on your property is fundamental, and it's a very important issue. And, often, those decisions are made by the borderline engineers in the department. And a lot of grievances come out of that. And this department -- this board has acted as a board of appeals for the last, oh, about eight years, I think.

Without having a board of appeals, what you have is everybody lining up in the Mayor's Office because he becomes the board of appeals. So everybody wants to lean on the Mayor to lean on the Water Director to get the water -- the water meter. That's why it ended up with the Board of Water Supply in the first

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 place. So rather than just let it fester, I would 2 suggest that we -- we make this board a board of 3 appeals. Outside of that, I agree with Susan's point that this is not something that's being raised by the community with any kind of real vigor. When I speak to 6 people about this, they say, leave it alone, it's working as it is, leave the basic fundamentals of the 8 governance alone, we have changed it six times. So, I 9 10 mean, we don't -- and there is no real urgency in the community to do it yet again. And even if we do change 11 12 it, it doesn't mean we'll get it right this time, 13 either. 14 So -- so given that, I would amend the motion 15 so that we create a Board of Water Appeals. 16 CHAIR STONE: Okay. Do I have a --17

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I have a question. CHAIR STONE: I think, first, I have to see if

there's a second to the motion.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: I second. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Wait, I had a motion.

CHAIR STONE: But they're amending.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: You're amending? So we're

doing amended motions?

CHAIR STONE: If it fails, then we go back to

your motion. Commissioner Hedani seconds the motion. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: He seconded.

CHAIR STONE: I'm sorry. Commissioner Hashimoto, you seconded the motion. Right?

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes. CHAIR STONE: Yes. Okay.

Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Question. Can it be done simply by adding into the -- what the Board of Water Supply does, a line that says that they will handle appeals?

> MEMBER DELEON: No. They do that now. MEMBER OKAMOTO: But is it in the --MEMBER DELEON: It's in their responsibilities

now.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: That's all I needed to know. MEMBER DELEON: That exists as is. What I'm

suggesting is you take out everything else.

MEMBER DELEON: So you don't have that -- that

22 second layer of -- of review and discussion that, 23 basically, gets ignored. And it gets a more efficient

process. You do have a board of water supply, it's

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Oh, okay.

called the County Council.

10/10/2011

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

220

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Commissioner Moikeha. MEMBER MOIKEHA: I would like to speak to Dave's amended motion. You know, Lunderstand where you're coming from. I don't think we need to do that. I think, you know, even administratively, that could work as far as what you're suggesting as an amendment.

The other thing is, this question about going back and forth on the structure, maybe it's never been the structure that's been the problem. Maybe it's who you put in there as head of the department. And if the Council now, and has been, the board, quote, unquote, making those water decisions -- I mean, you -- we had Dave Taylor here, and I think he just tells it like it is, and I wish we had all department heads that could do that, and that just lays out all the facts about what the issue is. And then it's up to the Council, who is the board here in the case of water, to make those important decisions. Now it's on them. And I appreciate his straightforwardness. And maybe this is more an issue of who you put in the place to -- to be the leader and to bring forth the facts and provide all the information that's needed for making decisions in this County.

I don't support -- again, I'm going to go back to my original motion, take it off the list.

10/10/2011

221

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Further discussion?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: Okay. We have a motion, amended motion on the table. We'll take that to vote by a show of hands. The amended motion is to change water -department of -- water supply department and board to Department and Board of Appeals -- Water Supply Department of Board of Appeals.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER DELEON: Change the Board of Water Supply into Board of Water Appeals.

CHAIR STONE: Water Appeals. Thank you very much. Very good. All in favor, raise your hands. That's four. Okay. So -- five. You know, that's

pretty close. Let's do roll call on that, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused.

Commissioner Sugimura. MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani.

1	VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: No.				
2	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon.				
3	MEMBER DELEON: Yes.				
4	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego.				
5	MEMBER DE REGO: No.				
6	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello.				
7	MEMBER CRIVELLO: No.				
8	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa.				
9	MEMBER BAXA: Yes.				
10	MS. KAHUHU: Chair Stone.				
11	CHAIR STONE: Yes.				
12	MS. KAHUHU: Five "yes," five "no," one				
13	excused.				
14	MEMBER DELEON: Fails.				
15	CHAIR STONE: So motion fails.				
16	MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes.				
17	CHAIR STONE: Back to the original motion on				
18	the table to remove this from the Active List. Any				
19	further discussion?				
20	(No Response.)				
21	CHAIR STONE: No. Let's take a vote. Roll				
22	call, please.				
23	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa.				
24	MEMBER BAXA: Yes.				
25	MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello.				

1 MEMBER CRIVELLO: I'm sorry. What are we 2 voting for? 3 CHAIR STONE: To remove this proposal from the 4 Active List. MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes. Yes. 5 6 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon. 7 MEMBER DELEON: Yes. 8 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego. MEMBER DE REGO: Yes. 9 10 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto. MEMBER HASHIMOTO: Yes. 11 12 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani. 13 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes. 14 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha. 15 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto. 16 17 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes. 18 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Sugimura. 19 MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes. 20 MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused. 21 Chair Stone. 22 CHAIR STONE: Yes. 23 MS. KAHUHU: Unanimous. Motion passes. 24 CHAIR STONE: So this subject matter, Water 25 Supply Department and Board, has been moved off the

10/10/2011

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

224

Active List.

Moving forward. Chapter 12 -- this is Page 9.
Chapter 12, Department of Police. Proposal Number
8.12.4, proposal to amend Section 8-12.2, Police
Commission, to add a new subsection to require that the
Police Commission hold public meetings in truly public
venues in different parts of the county four times a
year.

Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I move we take it off the

Active List.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Second.

CHAIR STONE: There's a proposal to remove

this from the Active List, seconded by Commissioner

Sugimura. Discussion?

MEMBER DELEON: I think, in opposition, it was my original concept. I think this is a problem. This is a board that is our sole representation to the Police Department. We have no political overview of the Police Department at all. This is the only way we get it. This board meets in the chief's office in a locked building, in a building that has almost no parking, and maybe goes out once a year. So if you think that's adequate, then go ahead and vote for it.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioners, further

10/10/2011

10/10/2011

225

1 discussion? Commissioner De Rego. 2 MEMBER DE REGO: I guess I have the -- about 3 truly public venues, I mean, the wording, I understand 4 what the intent is -- which I agree with, and this is 5 consistent with my own belief in openness and 6 transparency -- it would be nice to have at least a 7 floor by which the -- all the commissions, whether it be 8 Liquor Adjudication Board or whatever, has public 9 meetings in other places. We heard that they do that, 10 but this would actually add a requirement that they --11 they do go somewhere else and do have meetings in public 12 places. Now, we heard that happens. Why don't we just 13 -- my feeling is, why don't we just make that a 14 requirement, in some way, shape or form, to ensure that 15 it does happen in other venues. So I'm actually going 16 to be supporting this. 17 CHAIR STONE: Very good. 18 Commissioner Moikeha. 19 MEMBER OKAMOTO: As the maker of the motion, 20 do I get to speak? 21 CHAIR STONE: Yes. Sorry. 22 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Since Mr. DeLeon --23 CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Okamoto. 24 MEMBER OKAMOTO: I just don't believe it's 25 something -- it doesn't belong in the Charter. I could

R

10/10/2011

see maybe a statement, when we talk about boards and commissions, that say all boards and commissions should meet in a certain -- but to put a specific part in the Police Commission in the Charter is the reason I think it should be moved out.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I think this is something —
I believe in transparency and that it should be not
difficult for the public to participate or come to a
meeting. Sometimes the process in itself is very
intimidating. But this, I think, we could work into a
consistency of all boards and commissions. That all
boards and commissions, that they, where possible, be
held in a public venue. I think we could address it
within that scope.

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Just a point -- Chair has a point. But if we say all boards and commissions, that could be a stumbling block, because there's a lot of boards and commissions, and some of them probably don't need to go out. I think if we do, do something like that, we're going to have to specify the boards and commissions.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Well, my thinking on that is

where it states --

CHAIR STONE: I mean, the idea — I understand the idea. I'm just saying that blanket for all boards and commissions may be a little sketchy.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Personally, I think it's

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?

something, in my opinion, that could be discussed within there, we could figure something out. I don't think it's enough to warrant making it a whole Charter Commission -- a whole Charter amendment. Again, it's important, but I think, in my opinion, it could be discussed and addressed somewhere within -- when we get to the topic of boards and commissions.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: The word "truly" is there for a purpose. And it's underlining the fact that there's already a requirement that all boards and commissions meet in public plates. That's just — that's standard operating procedure for all governments in the United States, I think. Except this one particular board doesn't seem to think it applies to them. So — so, I mean, I'm underlining it here to make the point.

And if it doesn't -- we're not going to do anything with it, fine, but I want to underline the

10/10/2011

point that this is -- my experience is this board does not meet in a truly public place.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Generally, I think this almost falls into the category of trying to micromanage individual departments within the County. If you look at this particular Commission, we have 11 commissioners. If you look at the Police Commission, you have nine commissioners. When you think about the expense we went through to move our venue to Hana, Molokai and Lanai, once, and we're going to do it again, and to multiply that by four times every year, for the Police Commission, the entire staff of the Police Department, in order to make those meetings, I think it's very expensive and it's not really necessary. I think they do a fairly good job of outreach into the community. And I think mandating something like this — I think we have bigger fish to fry.

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: I think the best way to do this,

really, is -- and I agree with Commissioner Okamoto, Commissioner Moikeha -- to single out the Police Department I do not think is wise. To put the language

- we can put this in the Charter, that all commissions

10/10/2011

hold public meetings in truly public places.

(Inaudible) there is already a provision to that. If
you are going to do this, this means that we are
disregarding that provision there. We should not do
that. We should try to enforce that single provision.
We should put it in the Charter and require that all
commissions hold public meetings in truly public places.
That should be a requirement.

MEMBER DELEON: Who's going to hold them to
it? They got guns.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER DELEON: I'm sorry. I couldn't help
it.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: In going through the -because I'm looking at an old copy -- under -- let's
see. What was that? Article 13, General Provisions,
for boards -- Section 13-2, Boards and Commissions,

because I'm looking at an old copy -- under -- let's see. What was that? Article 13, General Provisions, for boards -- Section 13-2, Boards and Commissions, Number 11, "All boards and commissions shall hold public hearings whenever required or deemed necessary and shall provide due notice to the public by publication in the newspaper of general circulation." I mean, isn't the case that they're supposed to do that? That's a requirement for all boards and commissions. There's not

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

MEMBER DE REGO: 1--1--

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: Chair, I think the issue here

is that of accessibility. And I think that's what

Commissioner DeLeon is attempting to address here. And I would -- I would actually agree that maybe we could do something with boards and commissions in general.

My comment here is that the Police power and the Fire and Public Safety power, these are very two special powers within the County, I mean, you know, no matter which way you look at it. Okay. And they tend to be, at times, the most controversial. Okay. So more openness and more transparency for those particular groups is always better than less.

So, you know, I would agree with Commissioner Okamoto, maybe there's another way of dealing with this, but I think there needs to be a sort of floor, again, for all boards and commissions in terms of the ability to have access to these boards and commissions when they're meeting. And if -- if parking is a problem, if -- you know, if even the perception of having difficulty of getting to a meeting and -- and attending is the problem, I think the perception has to be dealt with as well.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioners, further discussion?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: Okay. The motion is to move

Chapter 12, Department of Police, Proposal Number 8.12.4 off of the Active List. Let's do a roll call vote on

this, please.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Wiger, excused.

Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hashimoto.

MEMBER HASHIMOTO: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: Commissioner Baxa.

10/10/2011

232

230

MEMBER BAXA: Wait, now. I have to be sure.

MEMBER DELEON: Moving it off the list.

MEMBER BAXA: To take off the list?

MEMBER DELEON: Right. Yes, you take it off;

no, you don't take it off.

MEMBER BAXA: Oh, yes.

MS, KAHUHU: Chair Stone.

CHAIR STONE: No.

MS. KAHUHU: Six "yes." Motion passes.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Proposal Number 8.12.4 is

11 moved off the Active List.

Moving on. Chapter 15, Department of

Environmental Management.

MEMBER DE REGO: Point of clarification, then, Chair. When the boards and commissions issue comes up, is there a possibility to add something like this that deals with all boards and commissions?

CHAIR STONE: I would say absolutely, yes.

MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Chapter 15, Department of

Environmental Management. Current section was in the

2006 Charter Amendment. Okay, so it's in the 2006

Charter Amendment. Proposal Number 8.15.1, proposal to

amend Article 8, County Departments, Chapter 15,

Department of Environmental Management, to add the

10/10/2011

233

function of sustainability to the Department of

2 Environmental Management and change the name of the 3

department to Department of Sustainability and

Environmental Management, and, thus, to create a new

department entitled the Department of Sustainability and

Environmental Management.

Discussion?

MEMBER DE REGO: Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

MEMBER DE REGO: Thinking about it, I actually agree with Commissioner DeLeon, it's possibly not wise

12 or even necessary to change the name, but I would like

13 to see some of these functions added to the list of

functions. So I would make a motion to move this to the

amendment --

CHAIR STONE: Stage.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- stage at this point. And then we can have a discussion right now about whether or not we want to add the word "sustainability" to the department. That may be sort of an ancillary thing

compared to the functions.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. We have a motion.

MEMBER DELEON: Second.

CHAIR STONE: It's been seconded by

Commissioner DeLeon.

q

Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So let me understand this.

Not only change the name, but create a new department?

MEMBER DELEON: No.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Well, that's what this says,

and, thus, to create a new department entitled the
Department of Sustainability and Environmental
Management. I'm okay with discussion of adding
functions, but I'm not necessarily convinced it's to
create a new department entitled --

MEMBER DE REGO: Can I --

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So could you clarify your

motion, Frank?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: Actually, I'm just looking at

that, it seems kind of confused at this point. I think all they were trying to do was to change the name to go along with the functions and to sort of highlight this whole idea of sustainability. I'm just saying move this to the amendment stage, and we can discuss this now, you know, in terms what we would like to -- if somebody wants to make a friendly motion to just, you know, do it in regards to just keep the name Department of

Environmental Management, but add the functions. Unless

you want me to do that right now.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DE REGO: I'm just trying to get this

moved to the amendment list.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: The Department of Environmental Management, as it exists right now, has two divisions, Wastewater and Solid Waste. What they're proposing is, basically, putting a third division on the thing, and that would be sustainability and environmental protection, essentially. And they're calling that sustainability. So it's, basically, another division. And they're trying to change the name to include that concept. My problem with — if my count's right, if — yeah, I counted 17 syllables in the

MEMBER DE REGO: Yeah, exactly.

MEMBER DELEON: Sustainability and
Environmental Management is just -- you know, I mean,
the letterhead would be like that. So I mean -- so, you
know, let's try to keep it under control. But I think
it's very reasonable to have these functions because
Maui County has to face these realities. The State's
not covering these functions. I think the proposal is

10/10/2011

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Very good.

MEMBER DE REGO: Can I amend the motion, then?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, please. Go ahead, Frank.

MEMBER DE REGO: Then I would -- I would -- to

-- listening to Commissioner Moikeha and Commissioner

DeLeon, if I could amend my own motion to say that I

would like to move to the amendment list --

CHAIR STONE: Amendment stage.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- amendment stage the

creation -- the addition of the functions to the

Department of Environmental Management, those functions

listed here, without any change of name.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Commissioner --

MEMBER DELEON: Second.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Thank you. Motion

has been seconded.

Commissioner Sugimura.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: So this particular proposal

is what the Mayor had recommended to us?

CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh.

MEMBER SUGIMURA: And so, therefore, right now

what we're voting on is that we're saying we're not going to create another department, but we're just going to add functions to the existing. So why couldn't we

just do it now without going through this whole Charter

10/10/2011

thing? I mean, why couldn't it just happen already, right? I think the reason why it came to us is because they want to create a whole new department to focus on this, which I think is probably why he came forward and said it was one of his top priorities. But --

wise, I just don't think the name is.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: That was my question, too.

Because in discussion with the Mayor, when he was here, there were many things that he said that could be done

10 administratively. I don't recall if this was one of

11 them. I would like to go back and look at that later.

12 But I am not in agreement to creating a whole new

department. I don't think we need to change the name.

But if this language will help direct their efforts into

sustainability, then, okay, I can be convinced. But,

again, is it something that can be done already administratively?

CHAIR STONE: Good. Thank you.

MEMBER DE REGO: Can I answer that question?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner De Rego.

MEMBER DE REGO: My feeling is -- and this was

my counsel to them at the meeting in Kihei — that if you want some sort of underpinning that has some weight in order to create a new department, especially with the County Council, and sustainability is an issue that they

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

1 2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would like to have as a focus for the department, what better place to put it would be in the functions themselves. So, therefore, now you have a focus within the Charter. It's something that they -- that the Council and the Mayor have to look at and deal with, because it's there. So it creates sort of a mandate to be able to do that.

> CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Okamoto.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: If you put this forward, and it's voted down, then it's going to be much more difficult for the Mayor to add it in. And I could see very easily that it could be voted down. People could go, what is this, no, we're not going to -- and no -- a blank vote is a no vote. You may be creating more -- if the Mayor can do it as is, my feeling is that's the way it should go. I would be voting against this.

> CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Commissioner Crivello.

MEMBER CRIVELLO: I, too, don't understand why the Mayor or Administration cannot put forth their -their vision to add sustainability to environmental management. I think you're managing your environment, you're sustaining your resources and everything that surrounds your environment. But if they want to add

additional functions, then why can't they come directly from the Administration?

MEMBER DELEON: I think the answer would be

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner DeLeon.

what they're trying to do is, basically, what the Charter Commission did 10 years ago with the Department of Transportation. There was no way the County Council was approving a Department of Transportation. But the voters approved one, and the Council had to live with the fact that there was one. And out of that grew buses. So what I think the Mayor is trying to do here is trying to create an environment that will allow him to get this funded and create this division through the County Council, with the voter's endorsement. If the voters say no, then it's not endorsed and then it's not moving forward, end of the discussion. But if the voters endorse it, then we move forward.

But it becomes a political football if it's just put by the Mayor in the budget over there. And the Council is going to look at it and say, well, this is a jobs program for Rob Parsons. It's -- and it's not really that. I mean, it's something much more substantial than that. It's not an employment program. It's meant to be something, a meaningful structure. But if -- but without -- without some kind of support from

10/10/2011

240

the voters, I don't see the Council doing it. MEMBER BAXA: Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Well, right now, in your 2006

Charter Amendment, this Number 4 was amended to read, "Perform such other duties and functions as shall be assigned by the Mayor." And that comes under Section 8-15.3. Powers, Duties and Functions. "The director of Environmental Management shall: Perform such other duties and function as shall be assigned by the Mayor."

I could see Dave's support of this if he were creating a new department. And it will create a position, a long-term position, for someone, and it will require staff and it will require funding and a budget and all of that. That's why I'm very hesitant in proposing a new department at this stage. And now I become even more hesitant in why do we even have to spell out the function when it's all incorporated in Number 4, and this was amended in 2006, to allow for the Mayor to have that input through his director. They can do whatever they want. And they certainly can focus on sustainability, and they can advertise it and they can put the bright lights out there, we're being sustainable, but you don't have to do it and increase costs of creating a new department. So --

10/10/2011

241

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa. Oh, sorry. MEMBER MOIKEHA: If you want to keep this on there and have further discussion, I'm open to that, but

MEMBER BAXA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER BAXA: I see comments here that are --

to me, differ from the intent of the proposal. I hear that the sustainability portion of this is going to just create a division of the department of environment. That is not the way I see it. If you see the language of the title change, it will read, the Department of Sustainability and Environmental Management. Even just the arrangement of the word -- words in that title shows that sustainability comes first, environmental management comes second. So it will not just be a division: it will be the main focus. And so it aims to create a new department. If I understand correctly, the intent is to focus on sustainability because sustainability is a feature of the future, how you're going to take care of the future. I think that is the intent. And I think we should keep this alive.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you very much,

Commissioner Baxa.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: One other?

MEMBER DELEON: Function.

But from Mayor to Mayor, that could change. So the next

Mayor may say sustainability doesn't matter. And that's

proposed by the Mayor seemed like a very good idea at

perception was that sustainability is a very nice word,

it's kind of in right now, it's kind of cool, but, from

my perspective, it's almost like the County chasing

after windmills, getting involved in things that it has

no business getting involved in. The County doesn't

produce energy. The County doesn't control population.

The County doesn't -- the County doesn't get involved in

food production. And these are all the kinds of things

doesn't necessarily have the ability to do things better

that sustainability is talking about. And the County

-- that's my concern, because I think sustainability is

critical, especially on an island. So I think this

the time, to me, in my opinion.

Do we have a motion on the floor?

on the floor.

CHAIR STONE: -- function to the department.

MEMBER DE REGO: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: First, I have a question.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Generally speaking, my

CHAIR STONE: Yes, we do. We do have a motion

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Hedani.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Okamoto. MEMBER OKAMOTO: Frequently, Dave has mentioned, you know, if the Mayor does it and the Council is against it. I mean, I would like to think that if it's something important, both sides could work together. I know Dave does not agree with that. But I do think that when things come out and they are important, that's what the Council and the Mayor can do together. I think sustainability is important. I don't

something the Mayor can work out. CHAIR STONE: Mr. Molina has some input.

Thank you, Commissioner.

think any of us would deny that. But I just think that

we have things -- the more things we put on the Charter

amendments, they're watered down. And I think this is

MR. MOLINA: Thank you, Chairman. Upon hearing the discussions from the Commissioners, if you would like, I could relay the message to the Mayor, and maybe Mr. Parsons, to provide further explanation at maybe your next meeting, if that is something you would like to consider.

CHAIR STONE: Thank you. Yeah, I'm sure. Chair has a comment. Susan, clearly, it's in the Charter. Obviously, it does allow for powers of the Mayor to add, I mean, this kind of --

than the State in natural resource protection.

take care of the roads, take care of crime and

prevention of crime, and basic functions of government,

rather than chasing after windmills, which is what, to

some degree, I view this as. So I'll be voting against

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

Commissioners, further discussion?

MEMBER DELEON: Some of my best friends are

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Can you repeat the motion,

CHAIR STONE: The motion. Oh, my gosh.

MEMBER DELEON: I'd like to suggest, under

CHAIR STONE: Okay. We have a motion on the

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

Mr. Molina's suggestion, that we defer this item and

I think the important things for them to do is

10/10/2011

the motion.

Chair?

named Don Quixote.

Frank, could you please --

244

1

6

7 8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18 19

20 21

22 23 24

25

floor. Frank.

MEMBER DE REGO: I'm perfectly willing to

amend the motion to defer this.

hear more from the Administration.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: We have to vote on that.

245

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Yes, we do. So there's a motion on the floor to defer this to the next meeting. Any discussion on that? MEMBER OKAMOTO: Do we have a second?

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Second.

CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Sugimura. Sorry. There's a motion on the floor that's been seconded to

CHAIR STONE: Oh, I believe -- did somebody

move this to the next meeting. All in favor, please raise your hand. Okay. Unanimous. Deferred to the next meeting. Thank you.

And, Mike, we should -- if we could line up the Mayor to be here for that meeting to discuss that.

MR. MOLINA: Will do.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Chair?

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Can we also hear from the

environmental management side of this?

CHAIR STONE: Yes, That would be Rob Parsons.

CHAIR STONE: Sure. Of course.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Besides just the Mayor.

10/10/2011

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR STONE: Thank you.

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Both sides of that?

CHAIR STONE: Yeah. Thank you.

second it?

1 2 3

1 Commissioner De Rego. 2 MEMBER DE REGO: So what we're asking is to have the department head here, besides Rob Parsons, out 3 4 of the Mayor's Office? Is that what we're asking? 5 MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yes. 6 MEMBER DE REGO: Okay. CHAIR STONE: You mean department head of 7 8 environment? q MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah. 10 CHAIR STONE: So we have three people we're 11 asking to join us. Okay. Very good. Okay, moving on. Chapter 16, Cost of 12 13 Government Commission. A number of proposals. And, also, don't forget, there's the Frank proposal, I 14 15 believe. MEMBER DE REGO: Birthday Frank. 16 17 CHAIR STONE: The birthday proposal. 18 MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair, how long are you 19 going to run? 20 MEMBER OKAMOTO: One minute. 21 CHAIR STONE: One more minute. Maybe we ought 22 to --23 MEMBER DE REGO: Defer this to the next --24 CHAIR STONE: Yeah. I think -- yes, I think 25 we're going to have to cut off there. And we have some

1 other items left on the agenda. All right? So, thank 2 you. All right. So we are putting --3 MEMBER OKAMOTO: Mr. Chair? 4 CHAIR STONE: Commissioner Okamoto. MEMBER OKAMOTO: Can we go over the people 5 6 that we're going to have come so that they don't all have to come at the same time --7 CHAIR STONE: Yes. 8 9 MEMBER OKAMOTO: -- for next meeting? 10 CHAIR STONE: We'll go through our balance and 11 got to make a decision whether we're going back to the 12 deferred items first or depending on who can show up. 13 Okay. Yes. 14 VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: Do we hang on to this? 15 CHAIR STONE: Oh, yeah. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: For the next meeting? 16 17 CHAIR STONE: Oh, yeah, please. 18 MEMBER DE REGO: Don't lose it. 19 CHAIR STONE: Don't lose it. 20 Okay. Sorry. Let me get a little organized 21 here. 22 Looking at Old Business, we have none. 23 And under New Business, we have discussion of 24 Communication Items. Is there any discussion on the 25 Communication Items we received in the packet or the

10/10/2011

items brought forward to us today?

248

4 discussed. Commissioner Okamoto. 5 6 7

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER OKAMOTO: I have to ask this. Dave, why was the West Maui Taxpayers Association proposal directed to you?

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Today's?

CHAIR STONE: I believe most of that was

MEMBER DELEON: I had a conversation with Mr. Pure, and said he was going to have a conversation with his board about the general topic of district voting. And I don't know why they sent it back to me rather than sending it to the Commission.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Commissioner Sugimura. MEMBER SUGIMURA: So I know I've always heard the, you know, West Maui Taxpayers Association, but how many members and how big is this group that made this decision? Kind of same like the real estate -- what is RAM, real estate association of Maui, is that what --

MEMBER SUGIMURA: Question about what's --

CHAIR STONE: Yeah, RAM.

MEMBER DELEON: Realtors Association of Maui. CHAIR STONE: Yes, Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: West Maui Taxpayers

Association has been around since the 1960s. It was created by Jack Lamar out of Napili. Originally, the

10/10/2011

1

2

3

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

249

Napili -- Honokowai-Napili-Kapalua Taxpayers Association. And they broadened their base to try to represent the whole community of West Maui. They retained the Taxpayers name because they were, basically, really originally concerned about infrastructure and services in the community, and then they grew into a much more broader community association. They are probably -- they are the preeminent representative organization in that community, like the Kihei Communication Association or the Kula Community Association. What their membership base is, I have no idea. I was not at their board decision when they made this decision. It was a board decision. I don't think it was a membership decision. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: 15,000. MEMBER DELEON: 15,000. Oh, yeah, Wayne's associated. VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I'm not a member, but --MEMBER DELEON: 15,000, yeah. It's a pretty broad-based organization. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Is there any chance that this group might appear before us for questions,

clarification? If not, I would like to follow up,

again, being consistent with what I asked RAM, because

they state here we're finding that a large number of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR STONE: And RAM. MEMBER MOIKEHA: Again, to find out what is the number of memberships -- members they have, did they conduct a survey or a vote --

CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- of the entire membership, or was this simply a board's decision.

CHAIR STONE: Uh-huh.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: That's pretty much it.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER OKAMOTO: Josh, I think you said "and

RAM," but we got the answer.

CHAIR STONE: Yeah, we already got that. MEMBER MOIKEHA: I'm saying, for me, it's being more consistent what I asked from RAM, those same questions.

MEMBER DE REGO: Same questions.

CHAIR STONE: Got it.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So that's why I propose it to

them.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Very good. Any further discussions on our Communication Items?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Okay. No further

discussion -

MS. KAHUHU: Chair, can I get a clarification on the questions? Are you going to be drafting a letter

CHAIR STONE: Yes.

MS. KAHUHU: -- West Maui Taxpayers?

CHAIR STONE: Yes. Again, just remind me by email. So West Maui Taxpavers, number of members and was the survey done, or a vote of the entire membership, and, if not, then who was involved in the decision-making process. Okeydoke.

MEMBER DELEON: I think the letter actually

10/10/2011

252

250

prove.

meeting agenda items. Next meeting date, next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 24th, 2011, at 10:00 a.m., here in the Planning Conference Room, the Kalana Pakui Building. Any discussion on the meeting? (No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. Commissioner Moikeha.

is going to be on the next meeting? Are we going to go

the list before we go back? What's going to happen?

10/10/2011

253

new proposals that Sherry got via communications will be first. Remember how we did it today?

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Yeah, I remember. That wasn't my question, though.

CHAIR STONE: Getting to it. And I need to actually review how much longer the list is, kind of guesstimate how much time it's going to take us and see who can make it. And we will do our best to line it up. Because, obviously, if people are here, we need to go to the deferred subject that they're here for. And we're going to have to -- it might be a little bit of bouncing around. So it really is going to depend on who can come when. And we'll try and schedule it best we can and in order.

Obviously, my preference would be to move through the entire list and then go back to the deferred items. I have no idea how long that's actually going to take. And if we can line up the -- wait one second. So that -- I know that's not a real answer, Susan, but that's -- at the moment, without reading through the rest of our proposals, that's what I've got.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: So you have to finalize before the agenda goes out?

CHAIR STONE: Of course. Yes.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Is there any way we can know

says the board or the association made the decision. And given the course of time, I think I had a conversation with the gentleman on like a Friday, and like Wednesday when I got the email. So, I mean, I don't think they did a major survey. I think it's safe to say that it wasn't. We can go through the step if you want to, but I don't know what that's going to

CHAIR STONE: We'll get the answer, whether it be by email or discussion. Okay. So next meeting date, discussion on next

MEMBER MOIKEHA: On the agenda, what exactly

back to the ones we deferred, resource people?

CHAIR STONE: It will be very similar --

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Are we going to continue with

CHAIR STONE: It will be very similar to this

meeting in the sense that, if we have any proposals, any

10/10/2011

sooner, prior to the agenda going out, so that we can prepare?

CHAIR STONE: The agenda goes out one week prior to the meeting. So my preference would be to work through the balance of the list and then go to the deferred items. However, if — if certain people that we requested for information are here, we need to work on those items while they're here.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I understand that.

CHAIR STONE: So that is my preference. So let's assume we're going to be able to do it the best possible way and work through the balance of the list.

Commissioner DeLeon.

MEMBER DELEON: Mr. Chair, I would like to request that all the items related to the Fire

Department be sent to the Fire Chief and to the Fire

Commission so that they can actually see the actual list and actual items we're dealing with, as opposed to a supposition on something they read earlier.

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Chair?

CHAIR STONE: Email me to send the list and explanation of the proposals, letting them know that these are all the proposals on the table, so that they know what they're going to be asked.

Yes, Commissioner Moikeha.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: I think it needs to be clarified, especially to the resource people you're sending this to, like this request by Dave, and to the public, that these are not the proposals. These are things that came from the public for general discussion. So they should take it in the context that these are things that came out of the public's eye, and we haven't yea or nay'd them yet.

CHAIR STONE: Right. Very good.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Because I think that was very confusing for the Fire Chief, reading an agenda, to be here today to address these that weren't things that we were going to say yes or no to.

CHAIR STONE: Right. Which was an unfortunate waste of his time. And I agree, it's just -- yeah, I understand what you're saying.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Send a letter to all resource people, this is what came out of our Active List --

CHAIR STONE: Yes, of course.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: -- from the public. And then these are the things we're going to be talking in general.

CHAIR STONE: Right. Actually, when I contact them, I clarify. Like if I can send a personal letter,

10/10/2011

I always clarify what the situation is. Because I don't like people to waste their time like that.

MEMBER MOIKEHA: Okay.

CHAIR STONE: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Hedani.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I just thought I would like to say that the Commission did a good job today in terms of addressing the proposals. We had a total 21 items that were up for discussion, and we acted one way or another on 15 of those. And we have eight more to go. So --

CHAIR STONE: Yay.

VICE-CHAIR HEDANI: I'm sorry. 14? 13.

CHAIR STONE: Very good. Thanks. Pat on the

back to everybody. Good job, guys.

MS. KAHUHU: Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt. One more question. The Board of Ethics Chair was the one resource person you guys weren't able to meet with because he was traveling. He's now back. So I just wanted to know if you guys were still interested in meeting with him.

CHAIR STONE: If there's something on the Active List for him.

MS. KAHUHU: Okay. So we'll just play it by

ear, then.

10/10/2011

MEMBER DE REGO: Excuse -- can I -- can I reply to that? I think that was under boards and commissions, when we're getting to this whole thing of indemnification. We discussed that whole issue of what happened with a particular incident --

CHAIR STONE: Very good.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- with the Board of Ethics.

\$o --

CHAIR STONE: Got it.

MEMBER DE REGO: -- I think that's where it

comes.

CHAIR STONE: So, Lisa, we're going to have to get together and coordinate so people aren't just sitting around. We'll figure it out. Okay. Great.

Any further discussion?

(No Response.)

CHAIR STONE: No. So I would like to adjourn this meeting at about -- without any objection, at 4:10.

Thank you, guys. You guys did fantastic, everybody.

Good job. Very, very good job.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, TONYA MCDADE, Certified Court Reporter of the State of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the proceedings contained herein were taken by me in machine shorthand and thereafter was reduced to print by means of computer-aided transcription; and that the foregoing represents, to the best of my ability, a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.

I further certify that I am not an attorney nor an employee of any of the parties hereto, nor in any way concerned with the cause.

DATED this 19th day of October, 2011.

Tonya McDade Certified Shorthand Reporter #447 Registered Professional Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter Certified Broadcast Reporter