

MAUI COUNTY CHARTER COMMISSION PUBLIC MEETING
Hannibal Tavares Community Center, Maui
Wednesday, March 20, 2002
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Teryl Vencl, Chair
R. Sean McLaughlin, Vice-Chair
Vince Bagoyo
Ray DeMello
Bill Fuhrmann
Gwen Hiraga
Stephen Holaday
Karolyn Mossman
Donn Takahashi

STAFF

Brian Moto, First Deputy Corporation Counsel
Ke`ala Pasco, Charter Commission Assistant

EXCUSED

Stephen Petro
Erlinda Rosario
Jon Van Dyke, Charter Commission Analyst

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Present: Chair Vencl and Vice-Chair McLaughlin; Commissioners Bagoyo, DeMello, Fuhrmann, Hiraga, Holaday, Mossman, and Takahashi; First Deputy Corporation Counsel Brian Moto and Assistant Ke`ala Pasco. Excused: Commissioners Petro and Rosario; Analyst Jon Van Dyke.

Chair Vencl explained the procedure for giving testimony. Testifiers will have an initial three minutes plus another minute to conclude, or they can opt to return for three additional minutes.

A motion to accept the minutes from our previous meeting was needed. Motion was made (Takahashi), seconded (Holaday), and carried unanimously to accept the minutes from Wednesday, March 13, 2002.

Motion was made (Mossman), seconded (Takahashi), and unanimously approved to accept into record communications from: Mercer Vicens, Jeff Faulkner, Tady Arisumi, Lucia Gouveia, Mark Fritzen, Michael Singlehurst, Jimmy Kawamura, Leiane Goo, Don Varni, Ted Fritzen, Ron Silva, Frederick Wong, Carl Takumi, Gregory Figueira, and the Maui Contractors Association; Tom Godfrey, Don Medeiros, and Sean Lester; and the Kula Community Association (provided handouts but will speak).

Chair Vencl greeted those present, saying that the Commission did its first round of public hearings last summer. They gathered input, deliberated, and came up with the 17 proposals outlined on the boards and printouts. The Commission is now receiving input on these proposals.

Final deliberations will begin the first week of April; a draft will be submitted to the County Council on April 19. The Council has thirty days to review the draft and make recommendations, and the Commission has thirty days to consider those recommendations. The final report is due in the County Clerk's office by the end of June to be prepared for the ballot.

An educational campaign (utilizing newspapers, mailings, radio announcements, Akaku, etc.) will begin by the first week of October. Commissioners are available to speak to various groups.

Chair Vencl introduced the first testifier.

TESTIMONY

MS. LYNNE WOODS

Ms. Woods is president of the Maui Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber supports the following proposals:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Two | Lengthening Council members' terms to four years |
| Three | Eliminating term limits |
| Nine | Clarifying the Planning Department's responsibilities |
| Thirteen | Committing the County to an Open Space Acquisition Plan |
| Sixteen | Regarding accessible public meeting spaces |

The Chamber does not support:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| Four | Eliminating a second election |
| Five | Allowing Council members to deal directly with County officers and employees |
| Seven | Regarding the Department of Public Works |
| Ten | Regarding Community District Boards and Citizen Advisory Committees |
| Fourteen | Reducing signature requirements for initiative and recall |
| Fifteen | Providing greater notice of meetings |

A few commissioners asked for clarification on certain items. Ms. Woods reiterated that the Chamber's position on Proposal Fourteen is to keep the percentage where it is. The Chamber supports specifying a minimum of 1% in the plan for open space acquisition. Many of the issues regarding future transportation needs and environmental concerns can be addressed with added efficiency (so don't need to create a new position). There have been a lot of talks about costs and how to pay them; this needs to be addressed down the road. Ms. Woods commented that if the Water issue appears on the ballot, she hopes we'd spend as much time as possible in the education phase.

MR. THEODORE R. HUNTER

Mr. Hunter shared his concerns about community projects (litter on Thompson Road) and proper land development. He says land development is a disaster unfolding at a faster rate than we realize. It's out of control; it's in control of the developers. The plan could work but it's not being enforced, and it's not clear enough. The government is afraid to stand up to developers.

Mr. Hunter supports Proposal 13 with a minimum of 1%. If you put a minimum in, it helps to ensure that it will really happen.

Construction people think they're fighting for their jobs, but the growth will happen; the question is how we want it to happen. People have rights but they need to stay within the plan.

Mr. Hunter also supports Proposal 9. Turn the Department of Planning into something effective. This is a very serious issue. Don't underestimate it; it's huge.

MR. DAVID CRADDICK

Mr. Craddick said the issues we face include political, legal, environmental, management, human relations, and public education concerns. These are all very complex and interwoven issues, and we need solutions that are truly for public good as a whole. There is no one right

answer. We must stay true to ourselves and to the community around us. Personal judgment tends to enter the equation, but these discussions help us navigate the issues more safely.

Mr. Craddick quoted first century AD Sextus Julius Frontinus (Water commissioner of Rome). "I am moved not only to devote diligence but even love to any matters under my care which I bring now to the duties of Water commissioner, duties contributing partly to the convenience, partly to the health, even to the safety of the city." He said this is all he wants for Maui, and repeated his request for support of Proposal 17A, which allows for a fully semi-autonomous Board.

MR. MICHAEL QUINN

Mr. Quinn, a member of the Water Board, supports Proposal 17A. He said that Water issues are emotional, so he'd speak to facts only. When the Board was semi-autonomous in 1989, total assets were \$153.9 million, a 90% increase. In the 1980 – 1989 period, we experienced a 217% increase in projects, and this was done with the lowest water rates. We're the first state to utilize state-of-the-art technology that allows people to pay their bills from home with their computer. There's been a 50% increase of water storage in Central Maui, a 100% increase of water storage Upcountry, and a 53% increase of water to customers. Water is critical to this island, and while there are clearly accomplishments, there are still areas that need improvements. Introducing a new policy into the mix could bring this momentum to a halt.

MR. PAUL SEITZ

Mr. Seitz, a Kula resident, supports Proposal 17A. He's been in the water business in Hawai'i since 1974. He's been a member of the American Water Works Association for over 20 years, and served seven years on the Board of Directors of the Hawai'i Section of the AWWA and as the Section Chair in 1994 – 1995.

Water management is highly technical, frequently controversial, often evokes emotions, and is always complicated. Water management and planning are long term affairs; continuity is key. Having the Department under the County Administration, which changes every few years, will take away that continuity. Politics also tend to affect rate structures, capital improvements, and system expansion. These are two of the prime reasons all other counties in Hawai'i have adopted a structure of a fully semi-autonomous Water Board.

Mr. Seitz believes that the checks and balances already in place ensure utility fairness and accountability. He concluded by saying that the people of Maui deserve the best, most reliable, and safest water system.

MR. TOM PIERCE

Mr. Pierce, president of the Maui Coastal Land Trust, reminded the Commission about the technical aspects and emphasized what purpose it's serving. The Commission has an opportunity to do something that is politically impossible to do on a yearly basis: put before the taxpayers something they can't do in the political process.

He supports Proposal 13, and said that the first three words, "commit the county," can be achieved by putting a minimum on it. The original resolution suggested 3%, but MCLT will live with 1% and he thinks voters will live with that too. The County is spending at least that much already. Let the voters decide if they or the county should be appropriating that 1% every year. Without it, there will be no commitment.

Mr. Pierce said he could submit an amendment regarding an advisory body and make a proposed resolution part of his testimony. This committee would have the support of many different interest groups (environmental committee, land planning, natural resource management). He said recommendations would be made through a series of public meetings then submitted to the County Council, which would remain responsible for final decisions.

Further discussion followed in which Mr. Pierce fielded questions about what lands needed to be protected, how the money would be handled, and stewardship. When discussing funding, he said that waiting until property is condemned would mean paying much more; MCLT's purpose is to buy properties before prices are inflated.

Mr. Pierce stressed that "open space" is an incredibly generic term that means different things to different people. The language should be tailored more closely to specific issues. "Open space" doesn't mean the land is open to everyone to walk on. Either the owner won't allow it, or it's too environmentally sensitive to allow that.

We're looking for a funding mechanism. Give voters the opportunity to say it's important to spend money on these issues. MCLT is prepared to do anything the Commission needs.

Chair Vencil reported that an open space zoning bill is working its way up to the Council, and asked how the Commission should talk about open space if the bill's definition isn't the same as the Charter's. Mr. Pierce said to look at these as two separate issues. We need to draft language that will meet the IRS' code requirements to purchase land. We want to use tax benefits that are available to land owners to allow them to make a bargain sale and reap the tax benefits. Have Proposal 13's acquisition language reflect that (it has to have a qualified provision purpose). Zoning is one issue, and it can't take care of all the problems we have to face. Keep it separate.

The majority of money raised is coming from private owners, developers, and conservation groups. This money allows us to start talking to mainland grant and funding sources to request matching funds. MCLT has been incorporated with 501(c)3 status since January 2001, so they've already made it through the most difficult period. They're now in the process of hiring an executive director; they got a grant, and are raising funds to help.

There are more opportunities than money right now. Part of it is purposeful; they want to make sure to tread slowly at first. More discussion regarding appropriations followed.

MR. WILLIAM F. CROCKETT

Mr. Crockett chose to continue MCLT's discussion, saying that he likes Proposal 13 as is. They're not asking for a mandatory dedication each year; they're just setting up a mechanism for the County Council to use as necessary.

What he finds distressing is the mandatory appropriation for these funds and wants to focus on that. Consider the number of needs the County has to take into consideration. Mandating through the Charter to appropriate funds every year is putting handcuffs on government when they're working on the budget. This leads to bad government.

Mr. Crockett said that government pays attention to long range planning too, and make provisions for that. You don't find mandatory provisions for a particular purpose every year. What happens if there's an emergency? Or if other special interest groups see this and get the Council to write special provisions into the Charter for them too?

In short, it's a good idea to set up a framework to acquire property, but to mandate this would tie the hands of the Council. It can only lead to a very bad government.

MS. ROBYN LOUDERMILK

Ms. Loudermilk is a Pukalani resident and a planner with the Planning Department. Some of these initiatives piqued her interest.

- 1) She supports Proposal 2, lengthening Council members' terms (stagger them).
- 2) She is opposed to eliminating term limits as set forth in Proposal 3. She believes eight to ten years is sufficient (if four year terms, then two terms; if two year terms, then five terms is fine).
- 3) Yes to Proposal 4; it could be a mechanism to get people out to the primary.
- 4) No to Proposal 5. As a county employee, she believes that what we have now is sufficient.
- 5) In Proposal 7, the intent is good but premature. We don't have transportation except for MEO, and they get funding. As for the maintenance of County buildings, the wording should definitely should be changed. Each department should have their own ability to maintain their own buildings.
- 6) She supports Proposal 8 (regarding the Public Safety Commission and the Department of Fire Control).
- 7) In general, she supports Proposal 9 for the Planning Department. There are various conflicting statements (check the cons); it's up to the councilors to make a determination.
- 8) She doesn't support Proposal 10. Why fight bureaucracy? We should look at something else.
- 9) Regarding Proposal 13 and open space, she supports the intent, but has lots of questions about spending County money, and not having control.

Commissioner Bagoyo pointed out that while one of the number one issues is traffic, the current Charter doesn't focus on this. He asked which department (Planning, Public Works, or Managing Director) should handle looking at the whole planning of physical infrastructure and moving people. Ms. Loudermilk replied that it's very interesting because transportation has a variety of roles that are all separate and distinct. There are models that get plugged in. They all have to work together, especially for the CIP. She's not sure which department would be best.

Commissioner Takahashi asked if Proposal 9 had enough emphasis on long range planning, or if we needed to work on this a little bit more. She replied that the short answer would be yes; however, we need details on how the General Plan would evolve. It depends on if we want flexibility or have something very specific in mind. If you have a vision, you need steps to meet that vision, but the planning process is ultimately a public process done by elected officials or various board and commission volunteers. If we look at the current General Plan, anything fits, but it's a public policy decision that decides whether it gets done. Community plans are supposed to implement the General Plan, but there's no mechanism ... zoning is way behind. Perhaps an advisory panel could assist the Planning Department with the General Plan and respective community plans. It's interesting, and we're going in the right direction.

In the event of two competing public interests, who has the final say? Most people just want basic information. Honolulu does an annual report, but they have a group of five people in addition to their planners that can use the data to support their report. We need to create our own, but we need to decide what we want to get out of it, and how to do it in a way that everyone can understand. We need to be able to translate, communicate, and understand the information.

MR. JAMES P. RUST

- 1) Mr. Rust supports Proposal 17A, making the Water Department more semi-autonomous. He was a Water member from 1991 to 1996. Mike Quinn gave a lot of facts. Please support more autonomy if possible.
- 2) He supports four year Council terms. They need more time before the next election.

NIKHILANANDA

Nikhilananda has testified at other meetings. He reiterated things he'd mentioned before:

- 1) He wants all 17 Proposals on the ballot.
- 2) He suggests adding a Proposal 18: "Do you prefer the current at large system of electing our county council, or should we move to a 9 or 11 district system? Establish a six month commission to investigate this.
- 3) Regarding the composition of District 12, Precinct 3. Commissioner Fuhrmann gave him the task of talking to neighbors, who unanimously agreed that Huelo/Pa'ia is much more tied to Ha'iku than Hana, but they're part of that Council district. Please clean that up.
- 4) Commissioner Bagoyo's question about transportation was right on. The problem is that we're trying to catch up. Under Article 8, include the Department of Transportation (includes infrastructure); create a separate Department of Environmental Protection. These are two departments we need. It's way past time.

Nikhilananda's three minutes were up. He chose to come back for three more minutes.

MS. JULIE HIGA

Ms. Higa is a planner in the Planning Department. She testified as a resident of Pukalani.

- 1) She doesn't support Proposal 1. The current voting procedure is against constitutional rights, it violated her rights. With a population of only 17,000, her vote is only 1/9 of the County Council vote, so she doesn't think we should adjust Council districts. We should either leave it as is, or make it fairer.
- 2) She supports Proposal 2. A four year term might be appropriate, but clarify term limits (two or three?).
- 3) She doesn't support Proposal 5 because the current system works. Staff can come to the office, look at files, and get information like anybody else. If they're allowed to speak directly to employees, it could create more problems.
- 4) She doesn't support Proposal 7. She believes it's a conflict of interest. It'd be nice to have separate environmental protection and transportation departments. It might work in Planning if the role is clarified.

Ms. Higa will come back. She has other recommendations.

MR. MARK RUDD

Mr. Rudd is on MCLT's Stewardship Committee. He also participates with Community Work Day and is a member of the Surfrider Association. He's waiting for these lands to happen and will take volunteers to clean up and prepare these lands. He's really excited about preservation, and encouraged the Commission to do whatever can be done to preserve Maui's beauty.

As far as people voting, he wants people involved. Once it passes, he wants volunteers, not government, to take care of the land. Once it takes place, volunteers can take care of these properties. The environment is critical to all of us, so please do what you can to take care of Maui.

MS. CHERYL VANN

Ms. Vann is a resident of Makawao; she works at Keone`o`io. She has gone down there to collect data and poll visitors and residents about the kind of activities they do while there. It's a volunteer program to protect natural resources, archaeological sites, spinner dolphins, the reef, etc.

She supports Proposal 13. While she'd love 5%, she'd be happy with 1%. It's important to put away a little every year for open space. According to a visitor survey done three years ago on whale watches, one of the main concerns was preserving open space and natural resources.

She shared more of the data they collected. The one year grant started mid-June of 2001. They found that approximately 775 people (300+ cars) were at La Perouse every day. They're collecting data to understand what's happening at our open spaces. More and more pressure is being put on this place. We need to set aside more land so that there will be more places for people to go (camp).

The average time spent at Keone`o`io is less than half an hour. 65 – 75% of the people are visitors. Residents are more likely to spend the night. Should a user fee be charged? Right now, she's working with the state and local fishermen to come up with solutions. She'd like to see management. Her group doesn't support making it a national park. Tourism dollars are funneled into this position when working on a grant. Money will eventually run out, and that still needs to be taken care of. While she prefers internal funds, she's open to ideas.

MR. WILLIAM KAMAI

Mr. Kamai commented on three proposals.

- 1) He supports Proposal 17A, which would make the Water Department less autonomous.
- 2) Proposal 14 is a bad idea. We already have a forum in place that allows people on both sides to express themselves with expert testimony. If either for or against, decisions can be made by experts.
- 3) He supports Proposal 6 (verification of responsibilities of Corporation Counsel).

BREAK

Chair Venci called the meeting back to order at 8 p.m. For the record, Commissioner Takahashi had to leave to catch his flight to Honolulu. The Kula Community Association is testifying as a group, so they'll have a consecutive nine minutes.

KULA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
Elliott Krash, Dick Mayer, and Steve Sutrov

Ms. Krash began by thanking the Commission for working on such an enormous task, and for keeping the public informed. KCA distributed a handout showing their Board's position and three new proposals (A, B, and C).

KULA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

KCA has a total of ten minutes left to testify. They made one comment regarding what Nikhilananda said about putting all proposals on the ballot. We may want to put the most important ones at the top of the ballot.

- 1) KCA supports Proposal 10 and giving CACs permanent status. They suggested considering having powers of the CACs established in an ordinance.
- 2) They don't have a position on Proposals 11 and 12.
- 3) KCA supports Proposals 13, 14, 15, and 16.
- 4) Regarding Proposal 17, they asked that we look at the handout and correct a typo at the top of the next page (it should say 17A, not 17B). If item 17A is placed on the ballot to specify autonomy, then it should be elected. They feel strongly about the public trust interest on Water. It should be broken out as a separate question. The Board should have oversight and coordination.

KCA had the following new proposals. Please see their handout for more details.

- A. Establish a "blue ribbon" nomination committee that will meet annually to nominate candidates for the major boards and commissions.
- B. Set the terms on volunteer boards and commissions for three years with the possibility of a single, one term extension.
- C. Parks/environment/open space board or commission. Establish a Charter-level board or commission to advise and assist appropriate agencies and officials on the management and protection of the parks, environment, and open space; to consult on the acquisition of open space and the use of the proposed Open Space Fund.

Chair Vencl thanked Mr. Mayer, Ms. Krash, and Mr. Sutrov for putting together such a comprehensive piece. Discussion followed in which commissioners got clarification on various issues (Recommendation A, Proposal 10, three year terms, Water, reconciling the planning process, etc.).

Chair Vencl asked for clarification on TMKs. Mr. Mayer said that if there's a proposal, he'd like to know what the tax map key is so he knows the area that proposal is about. Commissioner Hiraga said the Planning Department could be asked to change their forms. Mr. Mayer said the public notices that go out just fulfill a legal requirement; they don't give information. If you have the power to put a request for a form change on the ballot, then please do so.

CONCLUSION

Chair Vencl thanked everyone for coming. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.



Ke'ala Pasco, Charter Commission Assistant

RECEIVED
 Charter Commission
 MAR 12 2002

- Links and news shorts

(This update should only be going to people interested in receiving it. Please see the message at the end if this is not the case. At the same time, please feel encouraged to share this news with your friends -- good news should get around!)

History was made on March 5, when more than 56% of San Francisco voters gave a big thumb's up to adopting instant runoff voting for electing their most important offices, including mayor. Across the country, voters in 50 cities and towns in rural Vermont endorsed a proposal to use instant runoff voting (IRV) for electing statewide offices.

Despite well-financed by defenders of the status quo who spent perhaps as much as \$100,000 or more trying to confuse voters with slick mailings, San Francisco now becomes the first major American city to use IRV to elect its officials. It replaces two-round runoff elections that cost more than a million dollars a year, lead to low voter turnout and negative campaigning and exacerbate campaign financing demands. Depending on the capacity of the City's Department of Elections, IRV will be used either this fall or in November 2003.

Center for Voting and Democracy staff members Steven Hill and Caleb Kleppner developed a remarkable grassroots campaign, full of volunteer energy and that delivered more than 125,000 door-hangers in targeted precincts around the city. Leading civic organizations and elected officials rose to the challenge as well; endorsers included Rep. Kevin Shelley, who won the Democratic Party nomination for Secretary of State this week, and the Sierra Club, San Francisco Labor Council, Common Cause, NOW, Congress of California Seniors, Chinese for Affirmative Action, Latino Democratic Club, Libertarian Party, Democratic Party, Green Party and CalPIRG.

In Vermont, 51 of 54 town meetings supported a League of Women Voters-sponsored proposal to use IRV for electing statewide offices. Vermont IRV backers range from Democratic Governor Howard Dean and Secretary of State Deborah Markowitz to 2000 Republican gubernatorial nominee Ruth Dwyer, Common Cause and the Grange. Our New England regional director Terry Bouricius did masterful work on this effort on a shoestring budget.

Instant runoff voting (IRV) has the potential to crack open electoral politics to new voices and better choices. Used for major elections in Australia, Ireland and Great Britain, IRV ensures that candidates win with majority support in one efficient election. Voters indicate both their favorite and their runoff choices on the same ballot. If no candidate receives a winning majority of first choices, the weak candidates are eliminated. Just as in a delayed runoff, their supporters choose among the runoff finalists as indicated by the next-choices preferences marked on their ballots. Voters who ranked one of the finalists first continue to have their votes count for their favorite choice.

You can read much more about instant runoff voting, the win in San Francisco and the near-sweep of Vermont town meeting

Jon & Terry,

I understand that the Charter Commission has decided not to pursue instant-runoff voting (IRV). But just for your background information, I thought I'd forward this e-mail message I received today regarding successful IRV proposals in other jurisdictions.

David Raatz
 Office of Council Services, County of Maui
 raatz@abanet.org or david.raatz@co.maui.hi.us

votes on-line. Please see:

- * The Center's news release and two pre-election articles at <http://fairvote.org/sf/robmessage.htm>
- * A range of news and information about instant runoff voting at: <http://www.fairvote.org/irv>
- * The San Francisco campaign's website at <http://www.improvetherunof.com>
- * Coverage at <http://www.alternet.org>, <http://www.tompaine.com> and <http://www.thenation.com/thebeat>

You also will enjoy reading an on-the-spot reaction to the victory by Dan Johnson-Weinberger, the Center's national field director, below.

#####

Later this month we plan to send an update with a range of helpful links and information about our full range of work later this month and then begin a short, monthly update. As previews, we urge you to visit our

- * all-state redistricting guide, with news about how this redistricting cycle has been the worst in decades for restricting voter choice and expanded representation (the report is at <http://fairvote.org/redistricting/reports/remanual/frames.htm> and a widely-published commentary is at http://fairvote.org/op_eds/monitorjan02.htm
- * news about the growing movement to institute instant runoff voting and/or proportional representation for student elections: the University of Illinois and Carleton College recently adopted reforms, joining such universities as Harvard, MIT, Princeton, UC-Berkeley, Stanford and University of Wisconsin (see <http://fairvote.org/schools/index.html>)
- * examples of websites being developed in order to allow people to use instant runoff voting election on-line <http://www.demochoice.org> and <http://www.purpletech.com/irv>

Short news items from recent weeks include:

- The Utah Republican Party State Central Committee earlier this year amended its bylaws to enable the use of instant runoff voting in neighborhood precinct caucuses where state and county delegates and precinct officers are elected.
- More than a dozen states have debated instant runoff voting legislation in 2001-2. New legislation was introduced this year in Florida, Washington (where a well-attended hearing was held in January)
- It's an important time for congressional action on campaign finance reform and electoral reform. Among many, good website resources to track these developments include:
<http://www.electionline.org> (ElectionLine.Org),
<http://www.opensecrets.org> (Center for Responsive Politics),
<http://www.demos-usa.org> (Demos),

<http://www.constitutionproject.org/eri/index.htm> (Constitution Project Election Reform Initiative)

-- The Scottish Executive will forge ahead with plans to introduce proportional representation for local government elections. Scotland, Wales and London all had used proportional representation for their most recent elections. (<http://www.electoral-reform.org.uk>)

-- Pakistan will have elections for the first time in several years later this year. Elections have used only winner-take-all elections, but with separate rolls. Now proportional representation will be used to elect "reserved seats" for women and technocrats. Many in Pakistan want to go farther toward proportional representation (<http://www.dawn.com/2002/01/17/top1.htm>)

-- CVD staff and board members continue to speak regularly before organizations, students and elected officials - recent and upcoming talks include those at Duke, Princeton, Georgetown Law School, University of Indiana, George Washington Law School, the NAACP affiliates in South Carolina, Maryland and Virginia and national election administration conferences in Florida and Washington, DC. Contact CVD at eric@fairvote.org or (301) 270-4616 for more information.

-- Finally, our remarkable chairman, John B. Anderson, celebrated his 80th birthday last month. A guest on C-SPAN in January, John's year-end message to organizational members can be read at: http://fairvote.org/e_news/2001yearend.htm
This week's victories certainly are a wonderful gift for John.

Stay tuned for more news about reform and the Center's plans for 2002. And of course, as a non-profit organization in the midst of some exciting projects, we need support from the public. To learn how to support the Center, see <http://fairvote.org/donate.htm>, and enjoy Dan Johnson-Weinberger's message to activists late on the night of March 5th in San Francisco.

How Sweet is... Victory in San Francisco! From the Center's national field director Dan Johnson-Weinberger.

From the campaign in San Francisco right now -- there's champagne flowing, there's wild celebration and I can't believe it. I can't believe it!! We probably won!

This is a new movement for American democracy. This is the real deal. This is a real movement. We've all been a part of it. And we did it with heart and soul and sweat and dollars and effort. And I'm telling you, the Prop A campaign had the BEST grass-roots campaign of anyone in the entire city. ANYONE. We had 1000 phone calls made from people all over the country. We had small checks sent in from all over the country. This is amazing.

This is awesome. Unless you hear back from me in the next few hours -- WE HAVE WON!!! AND THE MOVEMENT FOR FAIR VOTING HAS BEGUN!!!!!!"

Absolutely delighted and honored to be a part of the movement for democracy, Dan Johnson-Weinberger

(To unsubscribe from this list, please hit reply and say "unsubscribe." To ask to be on this list, please send a note to info@fairvote.org. Thank you!)

Rob Richie, Executive Director
The Center for Voting & Democracy
rr@fairvote.org, www.fairvote.org

6930 Carroll Avenue, Suite 610
Takoma Park, MD 20912
(301) 270-4616

"Make Your Vote Count!"

RECEIVED
Charter Commission
MAR 21 2002

Subj: **Minority rule**
Date: 3/20/02 2:44:32 PM Hawaiian Standard Time
From: sean@akaku.org
To: TVenci@aol.com, Keala03@aol.com
CC: charter_commission@co.maui.hi.us, kqcray@maui.net, jvandyke@hawaii.edu,
Erlinda0352@aol.com, sholaday@hcsugar.com, brian_moto@co.maui.hi.us,
d.takahashi@princehawaii.com, petro@aloha.net, kmossman@ccmaui.net,
gwen@mhincnline.com, chana@aloha.net, vince_bagoyo@lanai-resorts.com

Sent from the Internet (Details)

Aloha Charter Commissioners and colleagues

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin had a front page headline on February 27, 2002 that read "State's voter apathy zooms to worst in U.S.: A report ranks Hawaii last in registration and turnout for the 2000 general elections"

<http://starbulletin.com/2002/02/27/news/story1.html>

As things are going now, the minority of the people participate in elections. In my humble opinion, the Maui County Charter Commission has a responsibility to address this fundamental flaw in our democratic process.

Thanks for your consideration.

- Sean McLaughlin