The fourth meeting of the Charter Commission was held at 2:30 P.M., April 7th, in the Cameron Center. The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Edwina Bright, in the absence of Msgr. Kekumano. Present were: Mr. Allan Sparks, Mr. Hideo Abe, Mr. C. Agliam, Mrs. J. Rodrigues, Mrs. M. Cameron, Mr. Ralph Murakami, Mr. Stephen Petro, Mr. Lloyd Sodetani, Mr. Joseph Souki. Absent, Msgr. Kekumano.

The Minutes of the last meeting were corrected to read that included among those present were: M. Cameron, E. Bright, R. Murakami, H. Abe, and absent, Mrs. J. Rodrigues.

Also, Mr. Petro informed the secretary that this was the fourth meeting, not the third, of this Commission. Therefore the previous minutes are corrected to read accordingly, second and third.

The subcommittee of Msgr. Kekumano and J. Souki conferred with Mrs. E. Bright and reported that they recommended that Mr. Paul Mancini be hired as a researcher/attorney to assist the Commission, as he is already familiar with the findings of the Charter Review Committee, and made the report to the Council. Mr. Mancini has been approached, and has indicated that he would like to be considered for the post.

The desirability of contracting for Mr. Mancini's services was considered, rather than the hiring on a straight employee basis. There was some discussion about his availability after the months of July and August, and the fact he may need additional help before that time.

Mr. Joseph Souki made a motion that the Commission hire Mr. Paul Mancini as a consultant for research attorney for the Charter Commission, and that the particulars of payment be developed by Msgr. Kekumano, Chairman, Mrs. E. Bright, Vice-Chairman, and Joseph Souki.

Mrs. Cameron seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Murakami brought up the question of a P.R. man to carry on the action if the Commission was disbanding in March. It was the consensus that this should be separate from the research/attorney position, and that the Charter does not specify that this Commission must be disbanded by a certain date, and that he thought it was expected they would continue to be in working existence until the general election, or whever the Charter revision was put to the public for vote.

Mrs. Bright said that the committee was looking into possibilities regarding an office, that several places were being considered, and that hopefully by the next meeting, they will have made arrangements for office space and equipment.

Mr. Douglas Sodetani, who was expected to speak at this meeting, apparently was not contacted, and Mr. Lloyd Sodetani was asked to forward the invitation to speak at the next meeting, Monday, April 14, at 4:00 P.M.

Mrs. Cameron reported on her research regarding Powers of the County, Article 2 of the Charter. She stated that she would like more time to do an in-depth study of the matter, but that she felt the delineation of the Civil Rights in the Charter was a re-statement of the Bill of Rights, that it could be made more specific, but that if this is done, it might exclude more people than it includes..it might be better to leave the wording general enough to accommodate all. Since the County operates under the State Constitution, any questions regarding Civil Rights would be referred there, or to the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Petro said that he recalled that the Mayor stated at the time that he "saw no harm" in re-statement of the Civil Rights in the County Charter.. it was a simple re-affirmation of the Bill of Rights.

Both Mrs. Cameron and Mr. Sparks concluded that the point could be debated regarding whether this belongs in the Charter, or is a philosophical/political statement, and that legal research may be needed.

Mr. Petro was asked to report on his research on Kalaupapa Settlement on Molokai. He said that he had called Mrs. Mink regarding her bill in Congress (in this, and last session) to have Kalaupapa established as a National Historic Park, to preserve it, and to give it historic significance. The question was, did the people want a National Historic Park, or a State Recreational Park. If they want it recreational, then there will be no recreating of the original site of the Damien establishment, and the State's economic condition does not warrant the expenditure of funds to renew and keep up the settlement as an historic monument. He said that of all the State Recreational Parks in Hawaii, the land has been turned over to the State, but that no money has been spent in maintenance of any historic sites included in this land. Mrs. Mink made a visit to Kalaupapa on January 6, 1975, and talked to the patients, who were all in favor of becoming a Historic Park, under Federal Law, and wanted the Bill to state that they may stay there until the last patient dies. Under the State's plan, within 10-20 years, the patients will be removed. Mr. Petro also cited several Molokai organizations favoring the Federal Bill.

As of now, Kalaupapa is State-owned, is not a part of Maui County, and the County of Maui has no authority to give the land to the Federal Gov/t. Mr. Souki stated that Mr. Rockefeller purchased land in Hana, and gave it to the County as a park, but Mr. Petro said the way that the laws were written, only an exchange could be made by the County--land from the County to the State in exchange for Kalaupapa. Mr. Petro stated that several of the lesgislators did not want a federally controlled park, as it would mean long distance administration, among other disadvantages; however it looks like the advantages outweigh the disadvantages in most legislator's minds.

Mr. Souki stated that under the Bill as proposed by Mrs. Mink, the State would turn the land over to the Federal Government, who would then set aside funds for rebuilding and conservation as a Historic National Park, and Mrs. Cameron asked if the State had to turn the land over to the Federal Gov't, couldn't it be maintained as State property, but have the State apply for Federal Funds for Historic Park purposes? She said she thought that Kalaupapa was a part of Maui at one time, but the needs of the patients were such that they demanded State Funds, and therefore the land was set aside as State-owned, only. It seems that reasoning is no longer valid.

It was pointed out that Haleakala was a National Park, maintained and run as such by the Federal Government, and that Kalaupapa would probably be similar in operation.

Mrs. Bright remarked that there was no bill regarding Kalaupapa at this time in the State Legislature, and that if Mrs. Mink's Bill goes through, it will be a National Park.

It was the consensus that since the Charter excludes Kalaupapa, that it is not legally under the jurisdiction of Maui, nor should it be up for con-

sideration before the Charter Commission, as they have no authority to make any recommendation in the matter. It was brought up in for review with this Commission previously in connection with defining the geographical limits of Maui.

Mrs. Bright said she thought they had discussed fully the issue on page 5 of the Charter Review, and it was agreed that the matter be tabled until further research and legislation..it does not now fall within the bounds of Charter Commission action.

Mr. Sparks asked that the pamphlets he gave to people on the Commission be read, initialed, and passed on to other members, so that the information would be available to all. He cited statistics on percentages of cities and towns using the council/manager, council/mayor form of government, and it seems to run about half and half.

Mr. Murakami asked how the proposals re the various forms of government would be put to the public..would the Commission look into the three forms suggested, put the report regarding that up for vote, or would all three be presented for reaction? Would the Review, plus material gathered at this Commission be presented, returned to the Commission for further, review, and then back to the public?

Mr. Sparks said it was his understanding that these would be tentative suggestions, and they may want to wait until most of the suggestions for revision were in before they were placed before the public for action.

Mrs. Cameron suggested that they go through Charter Review, and come to a meeting of the minds on each subject, then go out and get input from people on them. She suggested speaking before various organizations to get their reactions and suggestions, also.

Mr. Murakami mentioned that some of the issues were only brought up at one meeting; would this be interpreted as an issue that must be worked on by this Commission? It is less trouble to "sell" something that is of much concern than it is of one that is of little interest on the part of the people. Mr. Petro affirmed that, saying that for instance, the people of Molokai had indicated very strongly that they did not favor a council manager form of government, but would prefer to have all department heads elected.

Mr. Murakami also stated that the Commission must remember that every recommendation made must fall within the form of government stated by the Charter now in effect.

It was brought out that the Review was not meant as a directive, but as an indication of the areas to be reviewed, researched, and put before the public..Mr. Sparks said he thought of it as a good indication of what is of concern by the people; Mrs. Cameron saw the Commission as a channel through which information can be fed to the public and get information in return. She suggested that the Commission set up several sub-committees to work on separate projects so that time available will be used as efficiently as possible..then the Commission working as a whole could present their recommendations to the public after Mr. Mancini had done his research and legal drafting.

Mrs. Bright suggested that thought be given this problem in the next week, and definite solutions be suggested at the next meeting. It was asked that they think about how to arrive at a decision--majority vote, or a 2/3 vote; Mr. Sparks referred them to the "Guide for Charter Commissions" which would give answers to many of these questions. Copies of this Guide have been ordered for each member.

Mr. Murakami suggested that they begin identifying the issues, and the members agreed to do so and report at the next meeting.

Mrs. Bright was asked to formally invite Mr. Douglas Sodetani as a speaker to the next meeting.

The next meeting will be Monday, April 14th, at 4 P.M.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Hope Kimura, Secretary pro tem