

CHARTER COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 15, 1991
COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM

Present

James H. Cockett
Sherrilee K. Dodson (Vice Chair)
Dolores M. Fabrao
Robert Nakasone (Chair)
Victor G. Reyes
Allan Sparks
Anne M. Takabuki
Debbie Wright
Lloyd Yonenaka

Guests

Guy Haywood (partial attendance)
David DeLeon
Alice Lee (partial attendance)
Marylou Green (Mayor's office)

Excused

Jamie Woodburn

Absent

Annette Mondoy

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Nakasone called the meeting to order at 4:14 p.m., on August 15, 1991, in the Council Committee Room on the seventh floor of the County building.

II. APPROVAL OF JULY 18, 1991, MINUTES

The minutes of the July 18, 1991, meeting were approved as circulated.

III. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no public testimony.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Communications 91-12 and 91-13 were accepted.

V. COMMUNICATION 91-0, ARTICLE I

The Chair advised he thought it would be appropriate to start by examining each part of the Charter. There was no discussion or concerns on Article I.

VI. COMMUNICATION 91-0, ARTICLE II

There were no discussion or concerns on Article II.

VII. COMMUNICATION 91-0, ARTICLE III

A. Communication 91-7 (Agenda Item C)

1. Douglas Sodetani

Communication 91-7 is the 1967 Charter Commission Report. The Chair stated it was his intent that, by having Mr. Douglas Sodetani, member of 1967 Charter, attend this meeting, the Commission members would be able to get a better sense of how the Charter came about and why the 1967 Commission decided on the separation of powers with councilmembers and the Mayor vs. the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Sodetani stated that they were fortunate because they were on the "second round". The first charter did not go over well with the electorate. His recollection as to why it failed was because of the press being against it and a few of the big organizations, which, at that time, was a very powerful political group, also being against it.

Upon being appointed and then asked to be Chairman, Mr. Sodetani took it upon himself to ask J. Walter Cameron, Nora Cooper, ILWU members, Maui Chamber of Commerce members, and others, why they were against the first charter. He stated, in his opinion, some of the things were not too significant. The people he spoke with all felt the first proposed Charter gave the Mayor too much power -- such as appointing all department heads, including the Police Chief, Director of Personnel Service (civil service), and the liquor control/liquor commission chiefs.

Before drafting the charter, the Commission went to every community to find out what they wanted. They then felt they were ready to start writing the charter. They were lucky in that they had Kase Higa, who was very familiar with municipal government to help with the actual writing/drafting.

Some Commission members thought the Commission should be divided in various committees but he convinced them they

should all work together. The whole idea, he thought, was for the group to work as one. After several drafts, they came up with something they thought suitable. He stated not everyone got what they wanted. There was a lot of compromise.

Mr. Sodemani stated that the Commission was fortunate in that Mr. Cameron promised them a lot of press coverage. Reporter Jack Stevens covered all the meetings. Mr. Sodemani stated that sometimes he did not agree with what was printed, but, overall, he believed Mr. Stevens covered it very fairly.

A speakers bureau was formed. Different members spoke to the Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis, Lions, Rotary, and other organizations about the Charter.

Funds were solicited from different individuals and the private sector in order to promote the Charter.

The Charter was passed at a ratio of 3 to 1.

Mr. Sparks asked Mr. Sodemani how the Commission was able to persuade the people to look at the Charter differently. The first Charter gave the Mayor much power. The Charter they were promoting was not as strong "Mayor power" but still was an independent mayor. Mr. Sodemani stated that the majority of the Commission felt you must have the separation of powers between the administration and legislators to have good government. Mr. Sodemani stated that, originally, what the press and the Chamber, and others, were afraid of was the power of the Police Department. Prior to this Charter the Police Commission was appointed by the Governor and the Governor was appointed by the President.

Mr. Sodemani stated they also felt "threatened" because if they did not pass this second charter, the legislature was going to "shove a charter down our throats".

Their Charter stated the Civil Service Commission should appoint the Director of Personnel. The Liquor Department was the same way. They felt this was a good balance.

Mr. Sparks asked who appointed the Civil Service Commission in the past. Mr. Sodemani stated they were appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors. He went on to explain that the Board of Supervisors had executive and administrative powers.

Ms. Fabrao asked about the appointment by the Mayor of other department heads. She was informed that in the Charter only the Prosecutor and Corporation Counsel require Council approval. Mr. Sodemani stated that, at the time of their Charter, the County Attorney and Corporation Counsel was the same.

Mr. Sparks asked Mr. Sodemani if he recalled any discussion about a council manager. Mr. Sodemani advised yes, they had discussed that. He stated, however, that at that time, the commission did not feel too strongly about it. Mr. Sparks commented that it is still very popular around the country.

Mr. Nakasone asked Mr. Sodemani if he saw anything negative about the initial Board of Supervisors as far as being the administrative/legislative bodies. Mr. Sodemani responded that at that time, with the personalities involved, the kind of people involved, and government not being as complex as it is today, it was manageable. He stated, however, he could not see a Board of Supervisors today being able to manage that function as government. He would be more inclined to add the City Manager concept. Mr. Sparks stated, from what he understands, the old Board of Supervisors was called a commission form of government and they actually split up the administrative duties. Different board members were in charge of different things and it was very fragmented. There was no central place for coordination. As a result it is not a very popular form any more. Mr. Sparks stated he went to the library and got a few statistics. He found that about 2% of the cities in the country use something like that now; the Council Manager form about 37%.

Ms. Fabrao asked Mr. Sodemani, now that the Charter is in effect, does he feel the work he did was accomplished. Mr. Sodemani answered yes. The important thing he wanted to see was the four year term for the Mayor which is in effect now. He stated he would like to see the council have four year, staggered terms, because every two years is a lot of work and is not fair to the electorate, nor fair to the people who sacrifice themselves to office. He stated he made this request to the Cost of Government Commission but it was "shot down". He feels the council members would be able to feel more secure and make more independent decisions.

Mr. Sparks stated if that is going to be sold, it has to be marketed as being of a benefit to the general public.

In closing, Mr. Sodemani stated that it was a lot of work and a lot fun and he congratulated all the present members and expressed his appreciation for all the hard work they will be doing.

B. Corporation Counsel - spreadsheet (Agenda Item A)

Mr. Nakasone asked Mr. Haywood if he had prepared a spreadsheet comparing Article III of the different County charters. Mr. Haywood advised he was not able to complete it. He spent two and one-half hours comparing Maui's and Oahu's. He stated he would put something together by the next meeting.

Mr. Nakasone stated they are looking for something in which they could easily compare, for example, how members are elected. Also, Mr. Nakasone said he noticed in the Big Island Charter, they went back to two year terms after having four year terms for a short while. Mr. Nakasone noted the Big Island also created a reapportionment commission to deal with the district vs. residency requirement.

[NOTE: Because Mr. Haywood was present, it was agreed to discuss Agenda Item VIII. Unfinished Business, B. Timetable, at this time.]

Mr. Haywood stated he responded by letter dated August 5, 1991, (Communication #91-13) to the Commission's request for a timetable. Mr. Haywood advised he did not feel he was in a position to tell the Commission when they should hold their public hearings. He did address the publication deadline and other relevant items in the letter. He asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Takabuki raised a question regarding the wording of the ballot. She asked whether it should be a simple question with a yes or no answer, or whether more detail should be given. Mr. Haywood responded he thought this was something the Commission should be very concerned with. The way a question is framed has a drastic effect on how people will vote on it and, therefore, he felt the actual writing of the question should be done by the commissioners themselves. Mr. Haywood will check with the County Clerk's office to see if there are any parameters, such as a limitation of the number of words, etc.

[Mr. Haywood then excused himself from the meeting.]
[Mr. Rick Medina entered.]

C. Communication 91-3 (Agenda Item B)

Mr. Sparks summarized Communication 91-3, Article about the Model City Charter, by saying it is a review of the history of municipal government. There is an organization called the International City Managers Association that puts out a yearly report with statistics. For cities with a population of over 50,000, 37% have the Mayor/Council form, which we have now, and 59% the Council/Manager form. When asked if he thought there was a trend towards the Council/Manager type, he replied it seems there are a lot of relatively new, suburban cities that got into the reform movement that was described in the article. He noted that for the very large cities, 500,000 and above, the Mayor/Council form prevails.

Mr. Nakasone asked if we could obtain a charter of the Council/Manager type. Mr. Sparks said we should get a copy of the

Model City Charter that was discussed in the article. Mr. Sparks said he would order it from the National Civic League.

Mr. Sparks cautioned that the Council/Manager form would be a major change and felt, at this stage, we should not go to something that different. He explained what actually happens is the people elect the Council and the Council appoints a chief administrator, which works for the Council. He stated this would be getting away from the idea of separation of powers. He added there are a lot of arguments for it and against it. At one time, there was a lot of criticism for the Council/Manager form because the appointed manager turned out to be a policy leader. There were some people who thought this was not the original intention. He stated it is important for citizens to think about whether a key policy leader, who becomes highly visible in the community, and who is not working directly for the citizens but in essence is working for the council, is viable. Mr. Nakasone thought it would seem similar to a private corporation wherein there is a Board and a general manager. Mr. Sparks agreed. Mr. Nakasone also conveyed that it seems like a streamlined, cost-savings approach.

Ms. Wright agreed that it would probably be a cost savings but that it would be getting away from the separation of powers and felt there would be a lot of resistance to that. She continued to say, without getting personal feelings involved, that the County government is set up similar to that of the federal government. It is true that there can be waste, perhaps because the President is of one party and the Congress is of another, but they balance each other and that is why we have the separation.

Ms. Wright continued to say that if we look at municipalities which have the Council/Manager set up, and this is something the Commission might want to do more research on, you would probably find, because of the cumbersome, operational set up, he would become an operational manager in the true sense of the word and not a policy maker.

Mr. Nakasone concluded that this is something to think about and the Commission can discuss it again at a later time.

D. Communication 91-10, Items 1 and 11

1. Council Representative

Mr. Rick Medina represented the Council on Communication 91-10, a letter sent to the Commission from the County Clerk. In particular, Item 1 [changing the term of councilmembers to four years] and Item 11 [staggering the four year terms]. Mr. Nakasone asked Mr. Medina to explain the Council's reasons for proposing these two items.

Mr. Medina's thoughts follow.

(1) The four year term would be similar to the Mayor's term.

(2) When you get elected in November, and take office in January, you have only one year and seven months before you start to run again [60 days prior to the primary you must file your papers to run again]. This is not very much time to complete all the things you would like to do. It takes two to three years to try and get legislation and budget ideas implemented. That does not mean spent - just implemented. By the time the third year comes around you are just beginning to see some of the money you appropriated being spent. He noted that on the Big Island, councilmembers take office in December. He stated it seemed to him a big waste of time to wait two months to take office after getting elected.

(3) The cost is exorbitant for candidates. In 1982, he spent \$14,000 on his campaign. In 1988, \$17,000. This past election, with the exception of Wayne Nishiki, the average money spent on a campaign was about \$30,000. The most money spent by a candidate for council in 1990 was \$75,000, the second highest was \$42,000, the third \$37,000. This for a job that pays approximately \$29,000 annually. Costs will only increase. Mr. Medina stated he feels it would be less of a drain on the community if councilmembers ran every four years.

In summary he stated the basic reason for consideration of four year terms is (1) you would have time enough to do the things you think you can do and (2) maybe it would be less costly on the community.

In addressing the staggered term issue Mr. Medina felt that this was brought about because the public may feel more comfortable seeing candidates every two years. He felt that this was a major objection to the four year term -- not seeing candidates for four years.

He also felt that the four year term did not pass before because it was one question on the ballot and it is easy to vote no to one question as opposed to a bunch of questions lumped together. He believes this is how the Mayor's four-year term passed. It was presented as a package.

Mr. Medina stated he had walked in earlier when the Commission was discussing the City Manager idea. He thought this may be something the Commission should consider. He said he has served under three mayors and often, during the second term, the Mayor becomes a "lame duck; they can do anything they want". By having a City Manager type of operation, the council would run

every two years, they would appoint the City Manager who would carry out the policies of the council.

Mr. Sparks asked Mr. Medina if he could think of how many council members have been unelected, that is, failed to be repeat incumbents. Allan Barr, Abe Aiona, Lee Liu, and Charles Ota were mentioned. Mr. Sparks said it does not seem to be a lot of them so the argument that you do not have enough time to accomplish things is moot. He believes the real issue is the money it takes to be elected. Personally, Mr. Sparks feels a strong argument could be made that we should have four year terms, not just because it drains the community and it puts such a hardship on the candidates, but because of where the money comes from and who the politicians become beholden to. "How much independence do the politicians have to really use their judgment if every two years they are indebted to the big bucks guy".

Ms. Wright stated, however, you can use the argument, that when it is a four year term it is a "bigger plum". It is what happens in Congress a lot. She agrees that it is a huge burden on the candidate to run every two years but when you have a four year term there is more at stake. She is not convinced at this point it will eliminate the "beholden" point.

Ms. Wright felt it would be interesting to find out why the Big Island went to four years and then changed back to two years. Honolulu is four years.

Anne Takabuki stated, from personal experience as the Managing Director, she noticed as it got closer to the election, it was more disruptive to the day to day business. Mr. Medina stated that anything controversial, as it got closer to an election, did not get done. Mr. Sparks stated if you had staggered terms it would not remedy that situation.

Mr. Reyes stated he understands Mr. Medina's concerns about having to raise funds but asked if anyone had given any thought to why Mr. Nishiki can get elected with no campaign funds. Mr. Medina answered that, in his personal opinion, Mr. Nishiki spent a lot of money when he ran for lieutenant governor (television advertising which is a tremendous media for politicians) and he almost won that race. Then, when Elmer Cravalho quit and there was a race for Mayor, Mr. Nishiki spent a lot of money running for Mayor in that election also. His name was always out there. Mr. Medina continued saying that Mr. Nishiki says a lot of controversial things which gets his name in the paper often. He is a very unique kind of politician. Mr. Reyes stated what about the issues he stands on. "Do you run on money or do you run on issues?" More discussion was had on the subject but the Chairman felt the Commission was getting off the subject and steered the Commission members back to the discussion of a four year term and staggered terms.

Chairman Nakasone stated that Ms. Wright had brought up a good point about the Big Island reverting back to the two year term. They also created a reapportionment committee. He was not sure if the two were tied together. He would like to get a report from their Commission on their justification.

Mr. Yonenaka asked Mr. Medina if he thought money did determine the winner of an election. Mr. Medina answered that in a close race, including full page ads, radio blitzes, and direct mail outs in a campaign, which is a big expense, may make the difference.

Mr. Yonenaka asked of Mr. Sparks, since he was on the previous Charter Commission, what the public testimony was like regarding the two year v. four year term. Mr. Sparks replied that from what he remembers, the average citizen would like it to be "six months". He thought this was so because politicians have a sometimes largely undeserved reputation for being untrustworthy. Mr. Yonenaka asked why was it on the ballot if there was so much opposition to it. Mr. Sparks replied it was discussed in the Commission. They realized it was a hard sell for the Mayor and put that in as part of a package. If the council four year term was in the same package they felt it would have a hard time passing so they put it on its own. Mr. Reyes reiterated Ms. Takabuki's earlier mention of how the question is framed on the ballot. All agreed it was very important.

Mr. Sparks asked Mr. Medina if he saw anyone campaigning for county council using television in the future. Mr. Medina answered yes, especially with the local cable channels.

After no further questions, Mr. Medina left the meeting.

E. Communication 91-11

1. Representative.

The representative of the 1984 Reapportionment Committee was not able to attend.

F. State Reapportionment Commission Report

Because there is no written report from the recent State Reapportionment Commission, Chairman Nakasone asked Mr. Daryl Yamamoto, County Clerk, to give an oral report to the members. Mr. Yamamoto distributed a statistical report. This is the report that the 1991 Reapportionment Commission adopted and filed with the Lt. Governor at the end of last month. Unless the report is challenged and the court invalidates the plan, this will be the plan effective

for the 1992 elections. The report is attached to these minutes and made a part hereof.

Page No. 1, Congressional - Final Plan: The State of Hawaii will remain with two Congressional districts. The total population listed for the State of Hawaii is 1,108,229. There is a federal requirement that, for the Congressional offices, the Reapportionment Commission use the total population as a basis for reapportionment. The County of Maui remains in the 2nd Congressional District.

Page No. 2, State Senate - Final Plan: Mr. Yamamoto explained the reason for his pointing out the total population on page 1. The adjusted population on this page is 993,904. The Reapportionment Commission, in their initial draft plan, selected the adjusted population of 18 years old and over which translates into eligible voter population. There was much opposition to this throughout the State so the Reapportionment Commission decided to use the adjusted population, which is the total population less the non-resident military. Mr. Sparks asked what is non-resident military. Mr. Yamamoto explained it is military temporarily assigned to Hawaii that claim residency in another state.

There are twenty-five senatorial districts listed with the adjusted population for each of those district. If you take the total adjusted population, 993,904, and divide it by the 25 districts, the result target population is 39,756. Under the deviation column there is the difference between what the Reapportionment Commission came up with and the target population. The last column is the percent of deviation. The Reapportionment Commission is required to keep within ten percent. The reference table at the bottom of page 2 gives additional information, including each district's total population, population over 18, adjusted population, adjusted population over 18 years of age, and the number of 1990 registered voters.

Pages 3-5 is another report -- Incumbent District Report -- which lists all the new senatorial districts by number with the incumbent senator, the party affiliation, and the district the senator currently represents. The three districts that affect Maui are Senate District 4 (no incumbent), Senate District 5 (Senator Yamasaki), and Senate District 6 (Senator Rick Reed).

Page 6 is the State House of Representatives - Final Plan, with the adjusted population again of 993,904. That number divided by the 51 house seats results in a target population of 19,488. As in the Senate report, it shows the deviation amount and the percent of deviation. The next page is the reference table which gives you additional information, including each State House of Representatives district's total population, population over 18, adjusted population, adjusted population over 18 years of age, and

the number of 1990 registered voters.

Following that is the Incumbent District Report for the representatives, which lists the 51 districts. Of interest to Maui are:

House District 7, Roz Baker
(currently representing District 10)

District 8, Joseph Souki

District 9, Herbert Honda

District 10, no incumbent

District 11, David Morihara

District 12, no incumbent

At this time Mr. Yamamoto then showed maps depicting the Senate Districts and House Districts.

In the Senate Districts, the basic difference is the island of Maui now has two full senate seats and one canoe district that includes a portion of Kauai. That is Senate District 6.

For the House Districts, the one big change for Maui is the addition of a full house seat. There are now five full house seats and one canoe district. House District 7 includes Lanai, Molokai and Kahoolawe. Maui also includes House Districts 8, 9, 10, and 11. House District 12 is canoed with Kauai. The population difference there: Maui 7,183 and Kauai 12,164.

Mr. Yamamoto pointed out a few of the major changes. Lahaina town is no longer split in two; the district boundary is now at Honokowai. In Kihei, Maui Meadows, Wailea and Makena are now in the same district; however Maalaea is not included in that. Paia town is now in tact. In Representative Morihara's district, the boundary has changed. He no longer has Haliimaile, Makawao, Pukalani, and a portion of Kula. That district now consists of the upper Kula area, Ulupalakua and Makena.

Chairman Nakasone asked Mr. Yamamoto if the Charter Commission was considering at large or single districts would the commission have to establish some kind of reapportionment committee. Mr. Yamamoto answered yes and you would need to go through a process similar to that which the State Reapportionment Commission did. Mr. Yamamoto explained some of the problems experienced by the County Clerk's office. The optimum situation is if the Senate and House district boundaries are the same. If not

it makes the elections process more difficult. They may have to establish additional precincts.

Chairman Nakasone asked if we retained the at-large system, would we not have to be involved with the reapportionment process. Mr. Yamamoto said yes. He explained the current council districts. They are: West Maui, Central, East Maui, Molokai and Lanai. In 1990, one of the charter amendments that was approved by the voters was a South Maui District. He also explained that if you stay with an at-large districts, the districts have no specific meaning except as being geographical designations. These boundaries can be changed in any way, as long as it is described properly in the Charter so that they can be easily identified.

Ms. Fabrao asked if the commission could obtain copies of the map in a smaller size. Mr. Yamamoto said they will soon be available.

There being no further questions Mr. Yamamoto left the meeting.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Budget

Anne Takabuki distributed a proposed budget and reported that the budget subcommittee felt it was not necessary to ask for a larger budget at this time. Since the Charter Commission's term does cover two fiscal periods there will be an opportunity to request more money at a later date. She stated the subcommittee used many assumptions in preparing the budget and was open to suggestions. It was difficult to come up with the numbers because they were so many unknowns, such as how many meetings there would be and also that no decision had really been made regarding the hiring of legal counsel.

Mr. Sparks advised that the type of thing the Commission had asked Guy Haywood to do, i.e., prepare a spreadsheet, was something the last commission had hired someone to do. The thinking of that commission then was that they wanted to keep as much distance as possible between themselves and county employees.

Ms. Wright stated she thought the \$100 per hour for an attorney is very conservative. Ms. Takabuki agreed.

Ms. Takabuki stated the subcommittee just guessed on the amount of hours an attorney may be used. She used the figure of 100 hours. She stated she did not think an attorney would have to attend all the meetings but drafting would take a lot of time. Ms. Wright stated that what Mr. Sparks had said is a good idea but if we paid an attorney to do the spreadsheet and other similar tasks,

100 hours would be used up before you even got to the drafting, and that is where good legal service would be needed. A suggestion was that a good secretary or other staff person could be used to do things like the spreadsheet, or the Commission could use Corporation Counsel in the beginning and hire someone later down the line.

Mr. Sparks noted that during the meetings of the past commission there was an attorney who attended the meetings so the commissioners had someone they could turn to to find out what they could and could not do. A lot of the attorney's time was spent that way.

Ms. Takabuki stated the proposed budget was through the end of June. However, she stated the Commission should know if more money would be needed prior to that. The County budget is submitted March 15th.

It was decided to put this matter on hold until the Commission gets more active and would need an attorney's advice.

B. Timetable

This item was reported under VIII.B.

C. Report on Clerical/Legal Support

Vice Chair Dodson reported on how the Commission could go about hiring a secretary. She stated they had two options. One was to go through an employment agency who could guarantee someone within one week's time. They do all the interviewing, reference checking, screening, and send a half dozen or so to be interviewed. The only problem with using an agency is that they charge 4 - 6 % of an annual salary. The other alternative is to let ourselves do the legwork. A subcommittee of three or four people could do the reference checks, interviewing, etc. She contacted The Maui News for a price quote. A 2 column x 2" block ad would run \$193 for one week. It is cheaper than going through an employment agency but it is a lot more work. She stated she would not mind doing the interviewing if a couple of people could help her. The number could be narrowed down to a select few that the entire Commission could then interview. That is her suggestion.

The Chairman asked if she had gotten any kind of scope of work for the clerical position. Vice Chair Dodson reported that she went to the Department of Personnel Services and got the job description for a private secretary who serves as a personal/confidential secretary to the head of the County departments. She stated this job description fits the Commission's needs because it includes attendance at public hearings, taking

minutes, ingoing and outgoing correspondence, good communication skills, confidentiality, and other relevant skills.

She stated she could place an ad in Monday's The Maui News. Everyone agreed that would be the way to go. Mr. Cockett agreed to help Vice Chairman Dodson.

Chairman Nakasone asked about the legal support. Ms. Dodson advised she thought they could advertise for a secretary and attorney in the same ad and see what kind of response they get. She stated they would probably get a much larger response for a secretary. There may not be too many attorneys interested in \$100 an hour/part time.

Mr. Sparks asked about the possibility of personal pitches to attorneys that have the kind of experience the Commission needs. Vice Chair Dodson stated that is what she would like to do. She knows of a few attorneys that she could approach and ask them to submit resumes.

Mr. Sparks stated the sooner we can get these people on board the better.

Prior to going on to the next agenda item, Chairman Nakasone asked the members if anyone had suggestions about how to go about reviewing the Charter. He used his own discretion in taking one article at a time. Some members of the Commission agreed that was a good way to go. Mr. Sparks stated the only problem he could see with focusing on one section at a time and inviting someone to come, is that they might have good ideas about other sections too. If he recalls correctly, the prior Charter Commission spent a lot of time going to different sources they thought might have good information. They also spoke to all the department heads and other Counties' representatives.

Vice Chair Dodson advised that all receipts or requests for supplies should be given to her and she will work with Georgina Kawamura, the Budget Director.

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting will be on Thursday, September 12, 1991.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

APPROVED:

Robert Nakasone, Chair, 9/12/91
(by Maryem Green)
-14-

*** CONGRESSIONAL - FINAL PLAN ***

91-14

Plan Type : CONGRESS
Plan name : MILWAI2
Date : 07/11/91
Time : 3:57 PM
User : leo
Report : Population Summary Report

District	#Mbrs	Total	Deviation	Pct.Dev.
1	1	554,119	4	0.01
2	1	554,110	-5	0.00
		1,108,229		

Mean Deviation is: 5.00
Mean Percent Deviation is: 0.01
Largest Positive Deviation is: 4 0.01 Percent
Largest Negative Deviation is: -5 0.00 Percent
Overall Range in Deviation is: 9 0.00 Percent

(Reference Table)

Dist	#Mbr.	Total	Total18+	Adjust	Adjust18+	Regular90	OHAvoters
1	1	554,119	431,485	488,509	385,512	227,860	0
2	1	554,110	396,618	505,395	361,056	225,529	0
		1,108,229	828,103	993,904	746,568	453,389	0

Plan Type : CONGRESS
Plan name : MILWAI2
Date : 07/11/91
Time : 3:57 PM
User : leo
Report : Incumbent District

Number of districts with two or more incumbents: 1

District: 1

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
ABERCROMBIE	NEIL	D	1
MINK	PATSY	D	2

District: 2

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
(blank)			0

*** STATE SENATE - FINAL PLAN ***
(07/19/91)

Plan Type : SENATE
Plan name : BACKUP
Date : 07/19/91
Time : 12:15 PM
User : keith
Report : Population Summary Report

District	#Mbrs	Adjust	Deviation	Pct.Dev.
1	1	39,583	-173	-0.43
2	1	40,803	1,047	2.64
3	1	39,670	-86	-0.21
4	1	37,950	-1,806	-4.54
5	1	37,796	-1,960	-4.93
6	1	37,809	-1,947	-4.89
7	1	37,865	-1,891	-4.75
8	1	41,664	1,908	4.80
9	1	41,704	1,948	4.90
10	1	41,667	1,911	4.81
11	1	41,649	1,893	4.77
12	1	41,658	1,902	4.79
13	1	41,569	1,813	4.57
14	1	41,714	1,958	4.93
15	1	41,544	1,788	4.50
16	1	41,633	1,877	4.73
17	1	39,999	243	0.62
18	1	37,962	-1,794	-4.51
19	1	41,579	1,823	4.59
20	1	38,018	-1,738	-4.37
21	1	37,877	-1,879	-4.72
22	1	37,798	-1,958	-4.92
23	1	37,797	-1,959	-4.92
24	1	38,018	-1,738	-4.37
25	1	38,578	-1,178	-2.96
		993,904		

Mean Deviation is: 1,609.22
Mean Percent Deviation is: 4.05

Largest Positive Deviation is: 1,958 4.93 Percent
Largest Negative Deviation is: -1,960 -4.93 Percent

Overall Range in Deviation is: 3,918 9.86 Percent

(Reference Table)

Dist	#Mbr.	Total	Total18+	Adjust	Adjust18+	Regular90	OHA voters
1	1	39,632	28,142	39,583	28,105	18,193	0
2	1	40,996	29,658	40,803	29,534	20,594	0
3	1	39,689	28,002	39,670	27,988	17,153	0
4	1	37,954	27,742	37,950	27,740	15,230	0
5	1	37,829	27,399	37,796	27,375	17,128	0
6	1	37,819	27,636	37,809	27,629	18,078	0
7	1	38,079	27,906	37,865	27,750	20,561	0
8	1	41,961	32,550	41,664	32,324	23,739	0
9	1	41,814	34,185	41,704	34,088	23,137	0
10	1	42,020	36,106	41,667	35,807	19,220	0
11	1	41,784	35,666	41,649	35,559	19,727	0
12	1	42,000	37,080	41,658	36,782	19,804	0
13	1	42,099	35,101	41,569	34,612	17,971	0

14	1	42,054	32,743	41,714	32,527	18,405	0
15	1	48,874	36,330	41,544	31,428	18,664	0
16	1	75,606	54,372	41,633	30,486	17,094	0
17	1	45,679	35,206	39,999	31,010	19,982	0
18	1	46,157	31,764	37,962	26,070	16,871	0
19	1	46,118	33,272	41,579	30,043	15,174	0
20	1	46,983	31,898	38,018	25,918	13,904	0
21	1	43,453	28,096	37,877	23,941	11,669	0
22	1	58,582	41,584	37,798	27,037	14,957	0
23	1	38,763	27,176	37,797	26,328	15,837	0
24	1	40,548	30,585	38,018	28,710	20,289	0
25	1	51,736	37,904	38,578	27,777	20,008	0
-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
		1,108,229	828,103	993,904	746,568	453,389	0

Plan Type : SENATE
Plan name : BACKUP
Date : 07/19/91
Time : 12:17 PM
User : keith
Report : Incumbent District

Number of districts with two or more incumbents: 3

District: 1

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
SOLOMON	MALAMA	D	3

District: 2

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
LEVIN	ANDREW	D	1
MATSUURA	RICHARD	D	2

District: 3

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
(blank)			0

District: 4

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
(blank)			0

District: 5

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
YAMASAKI	MAMORU	D	4

District: 6

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
REED	RICK	R	5

District: 7

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
FERNANDES SALLIN	LEHUA	D	25

District: 8

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
IKEDA	DONNA	D	11

District: 9

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
COBB	STEVE	D	12

District: 10

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
KOBAYASHI	BERT	D	13

District: 11

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
KOBAYASHI	ANN	D	14

District: 12

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
BLAIR	RUSSELL	D	16
MCMURDO	MARY-JANE	D	15

District: 13

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
CHANG	ANTHONY	D	17

District: 14

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HOLT	MILTON	D	18

District: 15

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
MIZUGUCHI	NORMAN	D	21
NAKASATO	DENNIS	D	19

District: 16

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
WONG	RICHARD	D	20

District: 17

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
TUNGPALAN	ELOISE YAMASHITA	D	22

District: 18

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
IWASE	RANDY	D	6

District: 19

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
(blank)			0

District: 20

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
CROZIER	MIKE	D	23

District: 21

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
AKI	JAMES	D	24

District: 22

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HAGINO	GERALD	D	7

District: 23

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
MCCARTNEY	MIKE	D	8

District: 24

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
KOKI	STAN	R	9

District: 25

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
GEORGE	MARY	R	10

* * * STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES - FINAL PLAN * * *
(07/19/91)

Plan Type : HOUSE
Plan name : REDIST91
Date : 07/19/91
Time : 10:10 AM
User : leo
Report : Population Summary Report

District	#Mbrs	Adjust	Deviation	Pct.Dev.
1	1	20,098	610	3.14
2	1	20,394	906	4.65
3	1	20,409	921	4.73
4	1	20,073	585	3.01
5	1	19,597	109	0.56
6	1	19,485	-3	-0.01
7	1	18,907	-581	-2.98
8	1	18,584	-904	-4.63
9	1	18,605	-883	-4.53
10	1	18,570	-918	-4.71
11	1	18,608	-880	-4.51
12	1	19,347	-141	-0.72
13	1	18,757	-731	-3.75
14	1	20,042	554	2.85
15	1	19,880	392	2.02
16	1	18,907	-581	-2.98
17	1	20,452	964	4.95
18	1	20,431	943	4.84
19	1	20,239	751	3.86
20	1	20,190	702	3.61
21	1	20,306	818	4.20
22	1	19,167	-321	-1.64
23	1	20,284	796	4.09
24	1	20,192	704	3.62
25	1	20,266	778	4.00
26	1	20,387	899	4.62
27	1	19,960	472	2.43
28	1	19,579	91	0.47
29	1	19,588	100	0.52
30	1	19,214	-274	-1.40
31	1	20,435	947	4.86
32	1	20,202	714	3.67
33	1	20,163	675	3.47
34	1	19,049	-439	-2.25
35	1	18,767	-721	-3.69
36	1	20,032	544	2.80
37	1	19,051	-437	-2.24
38	1	18,665	-823	-4.22
39	1	18,936	-552	-2.83
40	1	19,908	420	2.16
41	1	18,898	-590	-3.02
42	1	19,776	288	1.48
43	1	18,785	-703	-3.60
44	1	19,092	-396	-2.03
45	1	19,024	-464	-2.38
46	1	18,622	-866	-4.44
47	1	18,615	-873	-4.47
48	1	19,304	-184	-0.94
49	1	18,828	-660	-3.38
50	1	18,684	-804	-4.12
51	1	18,550	-938	-4.81
		993,904		

Mean Deviation is:

615.21

Mean Percent Deviation is: 3.16

Largest Positive Deviation is: 964 4.95 Percent

Largest Negative Deviation is: -938 -4.81 Percent

Overall Range in Deviation is: 1,902 9.76 Percent

(Reference Table)

Dist	#Mbr.	Total	Total18+	Adjust	Adjust18+	Regular90	OHA voters
1	1	20,147	14,444	20,098	14,407	9,726	0
2	1	20,545	15,074	20,394	14,980	10,010	0
3	1	20,451	14,584	20,409	14,554	10,584	0
4	1	20,092	13,548	20,073	13,534	8,525	0
5	1	19,597	14,454	19,597	14,454	8,628	0
6	1	19,485	13,698	19,485	13,698	8,467	0
7	1	18,911	13,610	18,907	13,608	7,829	0
8	1	18,584	13,817	18,584	13,817	7,164	0
9	1	18,618	13,977	18,605	13,965	8,601	0
10	1	18,590	13,025	18,570	13,013	8,458	0
11	1	18,614	14,251	18,608	14,246	8,629	0
12	1	19,351	13,431	19,347	13,429	9,309	0
13	1	18,757	13,865	18,757	13,865	10,000	0
14	1	20,256	14,707	20,042	14,551	11,007	0
15	1	19,999	15,145	19,880	15,050	10,772	0
16	1	19,073	15,131	18,907	15,010	11,088	0
17	1	20,519	16,800	20,452	16,738	12,709	0
18	1	20,486	16,310	20,431	16,265	9,938	0
19	1	20,305	17,516	20,239	17,457	10,650	0
20	1	20,266	16,726	20,190	16,664	8,102	0
21	1	20,636	18,850	20,306	18,564	9,440	0
22	1	19,242	16,887	19,167	16,825	7,810	0
23	1	20,346	17,450	20,284	17,403	11,354	0
24	1	20,371	17,519	20,192	17,372	10,031	0
25	1	20,471	17,661	20,266	17,485	7,650	0
26	1	20,460	17,058	20,387	16,995	10,911	0
27	1	20,015	16,603	19,960	16,560	9,347	0
28	1	20,850	15,364	19,579	14,543	8,295	0
29	1	22,394	16,139	19,588	14,301	6,631	0
30	1	19,848	14,860	19,214	14,358	7,665	0
31	1	25,998	20,495	20,435	16,429	10,860	0
32	1	49,583	33,977	20,202	13,501	6,597	0
33	1	25,096	20,094	20,163	16,583	10,439	0
34	1	21,204	15,704	19,049	14,152	9,135	0
35	1	19,621	15,285	18,767	14,576	9,735	0
36	1	23,762	17,121	20,032	14,453	7,108	0
37	1	19,839	14,177	19,051	13,634	6,815	0
38	1	21,018	14,644	18,665	12,900	8,274	0
39	1	24,764	16,859	18,936	12,918	8,432	0
40	1	21,407	15,635	19,908	14,503	7,494	0
41	1	25,526	16,709	18,898	12,479	6,766	0
42	1	22,114	15,644	19,776	13,893	7,466	0
43	1	23,637	15,311	18,785	11,706	5,597	0
44	1	19,816	12,785	19,092	12,235	6,072	0
45	1	38,337	26,626	19,024	13,184	7,726	0
46	1	18,956	13,034	18,622	12,743	6,903	0
47	1	19,288	13,963	18,615	13,388	9,184	0
48	1	21,047	15,976	19,304	14,701	9,872	0
49	1	30,791	22,417	18,828	13,274	10,039	0
50	1	20,154	15,236	18,684	14,070	10,429	0
51	1	18,992	13,907	18,550	13,535	9,116	0
		1,108,229	828,103	993,904	746,568	453,389	0

Plan Type : HOUSE
Plan name : REDIST91
Date : 07/19/91
Time : 10:11 AM
User : leo
Report : Incumbent District

Number of districts with two or more incumbents: 4

District: 1

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
TAKAMINE	DWIGHT	D	4

District: 2

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
METCALF	WAYNE	D	3

District: 3

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
TAJIRI	HARVEY	D	2

District: 4

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
CHANG	JERRY LESLIE	D	1

District: 5

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
ISELL	VIRGINIA	D	5

District: 6

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
O'KIEFFE	MIKE	R	6

District: 7

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
BAKER	ROZ	D	10

District: 8

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
SOUKI	JOSEPH	D	9

District: 9

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HONDA	HERBERT	D	8

District: 10

Last Name (blank)	First Name	Party	Dist 0
----------------------	------------	-------	-----------

District: 11

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
MORIHARA	DAVID	D	7

District: 12

Last Name (blank)	First Name	Party	Dist 0
----------------------	------------	-------	-----------

District: 13

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
KANOHO	EZRA	D	50

District: 14

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
KAWAKAMI	BERTHA	D	51

District: 15

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
STEGMAIER	DAVE	D	21

District: 16

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
WARD	GENE	R	22

District: 17

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
MARUMOTO	BARBARA	R	23

District: 18

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
SAY	CALVIN	D	25

District: 19

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
IHARA JR.	LES	D	26
TATIBOUET	JANE	R	24

District: 20

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HAGINO	DAVE	D	29

District: 21

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
BAINUM	DUKE	D	30

District: 22

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HIRONO	MAZIE	D	32

District: 23

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
SHON	JIM	D	28
TANIGUCHI	BRIAN	D	27

District: 24

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
FUKUNAGA	CAROL	D	31

District: 25

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HIRAKI	KENNETH	D	35

District: 26

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
TAM	ROD	D	33

District: 27

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
CHUN	SUZANNE	D	34

District: 28

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
ARAKAKI	DENNIS	D	37
YOSHIMURA	DWIGHT	D	36

District: 29

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
ALCON	EMILIO	D	38

District: 30

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
CACHOLA	ROMY	D	39

District: 31

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HORITA	KAREN	D	40

District: 32

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
OKAMURA	TOM	D	41

District: 33

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
HASHIMOTO	CLARICE	D	42

District: 34

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
IGE	DAVID	D	43

District: 35

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
YONAMINE	NOBORU	D	44

District: 36

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
(blank)			0

District: 37

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
DULDULAO	JULIE	D	45
KIHANO	DANIEL	D	11

District: 38

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
LEE	SAMUEL	D	12

District: 39

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
(blank)			0

District: 40

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
BUNDA	ROBERT	D	13

District: 41

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
OSHIRO	PAUL	D	0

District: 42

Last Name	First Name	Party	Dist
-----------	------------	-------	------

AMARAL

ANNELLE

D

47

District: 43Last Name
PETERSFirst Name
HENRY HAALILIOParty
DDist
48-----
District: 44Last Name
APOFirst Name
PETERParty
DDist
49-----
District: 45Last Name
SANTIAGOFirst Name
ALEXParty
DDist
14-----
District: 46Last Name
BELLINGERFirst Name
REBParty
DDist
15-----
District: 47Last Name
TOMFirst Name
TERRANCEParty
DDist
16-----
District: 48Last Name
IGEFirst Name
MARSHALLParty
DDist
17-----
District: 49Last Name
THIELENFirst Name
CYNTHIAParty
RDist
19-----
District: 50Last Name
ANDERSONFirst Name
WHITNEYParty
RDist
18-----
District: 51Last Name
YOUNGFirst Name
JACKIEParty
DDist
20
