

**KAKA‘AKO MAKAI COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
February 20, 2008**

Attendance

Committee Members: John Thorpe, Bob Crone, Tricia Dang (for Mike Dang),
Michelle Matson, Nancy Hedlund, Amy Anderson,
Wayne Takamine

Participating Members: Dexter Okada, Sol Nalua‘I

The Steering Committee convened at 6:30 p.m. at One Archer Lane.

Introductions: Tricia Dang was introduced as representing Mike Dang (no relation) for
Kamehameha Schools (KS).

The agenda was taken out of order to review the Steering Committee’s and Operations Officers’ roles for the benefit of those new to the Committee, and to address any questions leading up to the discussion on Decorum.

1. Review of CPAC Steering Committee and Operations Officer Roles

The roles and responsibilities of the CPAC Steering Committee and Operations Officers as adopted to date by consensus of the CPAC were reviewed and briefly discussed. It was noted that the Operations Officers are expected to be available to attend and contribute to all Steering Committee and HCDA Board meetings as well as monthly CPAC meetings.

Amy suggested adding a clarification of the relationship of the Officers with the Steering Committee and, based on a CPAC member’s comments at the end of the last CPAC meeting, noted that this relationship may need to be communicated to the larger CPAC membership, and possibly repeated at each CPAC meeting.

Sol interjected and reiterated at length his own rendition of how the CPAC should operate, with the Steering Committee being a temporary ad hoc committee to sunset upon election of the officers, who would then become an executive committee and take over setting the agenda and planning the meetings.

Michelle reminded Sol that as also mentioned at the CPAC meeting on February 12, the CPAC as a whole has consistently voted on and adopted recommendations from the Steering Committee as well as proposals from the floor, and has long since progressed past his repeated proposals with the following results:

- By CPAC consensus, the Steering Committee has been confirmed as an authorized standing committee;
- The Committee’s size and its members have been and will continue to be endorsed by the full CPAC;
- CPAC Officers were voted upon to represent the CPAC and share duties of planning CPAC meetings and setting the agenda with the Steering Committee and facilitators;

- Any proposed deviations from the CPAC's consensus of record would have to be considered and voted on by the full CPAC.

The functions of the Steering Committee, Officers and facilitators were then highlighted jointly by Committee members:

- The Committee convenes to collectively discuss the CPAC meeting agenda, and the facilitators are also part of the meeting agenda process as it progresses;
- At CPAC meetings the facilitators lead the agenda and take meeting notes;
- The Committee reviews, corrects and approves CPAC meeting summaries which are then subject to approval and adoption by the full CPAC;
- The CPAC Secretary records Steering Committee meetings;
- The Committee reviews, approves and adopts the Committee's meeting summaries;
- The Committee evaluates issues before the CPAC and develops worthy recommendations for CPAC consideration, deliberation and decision-making;
- The Committee drafts and delivers CPAC communications to the HCDA;
- Once elected, Officers participate in Committee meetings and, in lieu of the Committee, the Chair will represent the CPAC as will the Vice Chairs when the Chair is not available;
- Officers are expected to attend CPAC, HCDA and Committee meetings.

Amy referred to the Committee and facilitators forming the CPAC meeting agendas, and asked if the larger group also suggests agenda items. It was noted that this opportunity is presented by the facilitators at the end of each CPAC meeting for consideration at the next Committee meeting.

It was agreed that the Committee's size, functions and process have worked well. However, it was again pointed out that there have been ongoing problems with the CPAC meeting notes taken at the meetings and received by the Committee, which have entailed extensive time and work to complete.

Amy noted some duplication in the responsibilities of the Officers and Steering Committee, but acknowledged the emerging structure and the considerable progress made.

2. CPAC Meeting Decorum

Michelle commented that several people have brought up the issue of questionable decorum exhibited by certain CPAC participating members, with this also having been experienced at this and other Committee meetings, and she invited Dexter to speak on this.

Dexter offered clarification that he would not be speaking as a Committee participant because he also serves on the HCDA board, and therefore he would speak as an individual observer and as one who attends the CPAC meetings representing his own Kaka'ako business community.

- Dexter noted that he had been involved in Kaka'ako issues even before Ron Iwami, and has invested a lot of time in this. During the Save Our Kaka'ako movement throughout the 2006 Legislative session there was a natural distrust of HCDA; now this has carried over into the CPAC meetings. He is disappointed because there is noticeable distrust in the comments made by a few participants despite the CPAC trying to make good efforts.
- He pointed out that because of this distrust CPAC's focus is diverted and the CPAC will not be able to accomplish what they are trying to do; and unfortunately time won't wait and opportunities for the CPAC will fade.

- He added that people all have different interests, and they need to leave their baggage at the door if they want to accomplish something good.
- Dexter suggested that negative focus needs to be re-directed and restored to constructive conduct, and recommended beginning the CPAC meetings in a positive manner so participants will feel welcome and develop confidence and trust, and will then be able to focus on what the CPAC is trying to accomplish.
- He noted that Michael Goshi, the former HCDA chair, stated at the working group's introductory meeting that the planning approach needs to be with open minds and open hearts. He noted that the CPAC is not selecting, but advising on the plan for Kaka'ako Makai, and the HCDA has the final decision.
- Therefore, the CPAC's participating members must be positive and trust each other that they are all trying to do the right thing, because if this trust is absent the CPAC will be held back and will not succeed.

Committee members agreed that redundant individual crusades and repeated disruptions have consistently challenged the CPAC's work, and are not conducive to the CPAC's progress. The chronic adversarial interventions, argumentative demeanor and personally envisioned privilege to repeatedly retort and make demands were noted to be extremely disruptive, and it was emphasized that this was contrary to conducting meetings in a businesslike manner and progressing positively to address the tasks at hand.

It was noted that the agreements for the procedures followed have come from the full CPAC, which considers the Steering Committee's recommendations on the Consent Agendas and ultimately makes the decisions, and all are well-meaning citizens trying to do a good job.

It was emphasized that CPAC meetings are not a place to pick apart others, but a place to pull together and be positive and productive, and there is a desire to see this productivity return, to see the CPAC join together and move forward together, and to see the CPAC working toward Hawaiian culture without constant confrontational comments. It was pointed out that, while everyone has different opinions and comments that are not identical, the concern is not the content but the tone in which comments are delivered and repeatedly revisited.

Additional discussion followed:

- Michelle encouraged the Committee to convey positive change to the CPAC and suggested that perhaps the CPAC participating members could have an agreement between themselves, such as the memorandum of understanding which Wayne had suggested, or an internal covenant similar to that suggested by Kem.
- Nancy agreed with making positive statements on better communication.
- Dexter commented that the Officers could also encourage communication within the CPAC to regain trust to reach consensus.
- Wayne agreed with moving forward with fresh motivation.
- Sol advocated spirited debate with comparisons of proposals and productive results.
- Several Committee members supported spirited debate, but not negative delivery.
- Dexter also supported spirited debate, but noted that all ideas should be on the table to evaluate before debate, because if debate is premature good ideas can be lost.
- Tricia asked if background work is done before meetings, i.e., can examples be provided to CPAC members or committees to be worked on between CPAC meetings, and then presented more efficiently at the meetings.

- Bob commented that the focus needs to be on the tone of the discussions, and there is a difference between constructive debate and the harshness experienced at these meetings. He explained that he looks forward to leaving meetings feeling uplifted from progress being made, but finds himself feeling stressed from the confrontational conduct. He added that the focus at CPAC meetings needs to be on constructive discussion controlled by the facilitators.
- All agreed to participate in future meetings with a greater degree of decorum and objectivity.

Michelle proposed, and it was agreed by all present, to set an example for the CPAC by being respectful of each other's efforts even if not agreeing with every idea or comment, and by being constructive and supportive to move forward together in a positive manner.

3. Election Ballot Count Verification

As the CPAC Secretary, Michelle had received the election ballots and tallies from the facilitators at the February 12 CPAC meeting for verification by the Steering Committee. Michelle reported the following to the Committee:

During the first election, 28 ballots were cast out of 31 CPAC participating members eligible to vote given their attendance at 4 out of the past 7 CPAC meetings. The results of the facilitators' tally of the ballots were verified as follows:

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----|
| Chairperson | Mark Wong | 22 votes | 79% |
| 1st Vice-Chairperson | Ron Iwami | 14 votes | 50% |
| | Jim Howe | 4 votes | 14% |
| 2 nd Vice Chairperson | Amy Anderson | 21 votes | 75% |
| Secretary | Michelle Matson | 22 votes | 79% |
| Runoff Election: | | | |
| 1st Vice-Chairperson | Ron Iwami | 11 votes | 52% |
| | Jim Howe | 10 votes | 48% |

4. CPAC Report to the HCDA

CPAC events worthy of reporting to the HCDA were determined to be the following:

- February Election of Officers
- February Presentation of the Kaka'ako Shoreline Park Plan (2006 People's Plan)
- Kaka'ako Makai Visioning –
 - Preliminary Visioning Input – January and February
 - Development of Vision Statement - March

5. Visioning and Programming

CPAC Vision Process

Amy asked how the visioning process would be defined. Nancy explained that the facilitators are in charge of the methodology, and this could be discussed first on the next CPAC meeting agenda.

- Michelle clarified that the facilitators initially described the basic process with a preliminary PowerPoint that included definitions and examples of visioning and guiding principles, and there will be more information on this from the facilitators at the next meeting.
- Nancy proposed a ground rule for the visioning to be a constructive interactional topic, with open discussion to evoke positive suggestions without limitations, and with all contributing equally.
- Bob added that the visioning and guiding principles would include the entire CPAC, and this process would lead to the planning process. He suggested that a planning committee may be needed if the process gets bogged down.
- Nancy agreed that the momentum needs to remain high, and added that instead of a committee doing the work an extra meeting could be called for all interested CPAC members to attend, or the regular CPAC meeting time could be extended from 7 pm to 10 pm.
- Michelle noted that given the preliminary visioning input, a committee may be needed to compile and categorize all the suggestions received for CPAC evaluation.
- Tricia noted everyone needs to have a common understanding of the meanings of the planning terms, and she offered to email definitions of missions, visions, measurable goals, etc. Committee members welcomed Tricia's proposal.
- Wayne noted that the vision would be broader than the guiding principles.
- Bob and others agreed that the vision is a broad statement.

Programming - CPAC Planning Template

John proposed finding a way to keep track of plan elements proposed in presentations to date and during forthcoming the CPAC planning process, and suggested constructing a template for this purpose.

- Bob emphasized that the CPAC's vision and guiding principles for the planning of Kaka'ako Makai will need to take precedence
- Others suggested that while visioning and guiding principles move forward a small group could begin review of the plans presented and convert the data into a basic template of the elements, as this would take time to put together.
- It was agreed by the Committee that further discussion was needed for determining the timing and oversight, attracting the participants, accumulating the data, and designing the template.
- It was decided that before recommending this proposal to the CPAC it would be helpful to create an example of the proposed template and determine any resources available from the HCDA.

The proposal was therefore deferred by the Committee until the next meeting.

6. Steering Committee Transition from Interim to Standing Committee

Bob reviewed the transition options provided at the February 12 CPAC meeting:

- Option 1 - 4 officers, but this is now obsolete because 2 ex-officio members have been added
- Option 2 - 4 officers and elected at-large members, also now obsolete
- Option 3 - 4 officers and one representative of each of the three other standing committees, but this is impractical because the three other standing committees are task committees not functioning on a regular basis.
- Option 4 – 4 officers, 2 ex-officio members and 5 elected at-large members

It was noted that at the February 12 meeting the CPAC voted to include on the Committee two ex-officio members appointed by KS and OHA, totaling 6 official positions including the 4 newly-elected officers, with the remaining number of Committee members to be determined upon expiration of the interim first six-month term of the Committee.

Discussion followed:

- Bob commented that the present Committee size has been working well, and a smaller or larger group may be less effective. He added that an odd number of members is desirable for majority determinations.
- Sol suggested that the elected Committee members be limited to 3.
- Michelle suggested an alternative of 7 elected Committee members to better represent the community.
- Amy and Nancy noted there could be additional options of 3, 5 or 7 elected Committee members.
- Sol suggested presenting one recommendation for Option 4, with the option of 3, 5 or 7 at-large elected Committee members.
- Michelle agreed and thanked Sol for his constructive suggestion.

The Committee agreed by consensus to recommend Option 4 to the CPAC with the choice of 3, 5 or 7 at-large elected Committee members.

A question arose regarding the Officers' and facilitators' roles in the Committee meetings.

Discussion followed:

- Michelle explained that the facilitators were present at the Committee meetings to work with the Committee to form the agenda for the next CPAC meeting, and other than this the Committee proceeds with their own agenda and meeting record.
- It was noted that the facilitators charge by the hour and their contract limit with the HCDA is \$52,800, which includes assisting with development of CPAC agendas, preparing for and facilitating discussion at CPAC meetings, and providing a record of those meetings.
- John suggested that the long-range consideration would be the facilitators' contract.
- Michelle added that at times the Committee has had to cut discussion and meeting time to accommodate the facilitators' time limits.
- Bob suggested for the sake of efficiency that the facilitators could be asked to be present just for the CPAC agenda portion of the meeting
- Wayne added that the facilitators' attendance at the Committee meetings allows them more time to provide input on the CPAC meeting agendas and run the CPAC meetings more effectively.

- Tricia commented that in her experience the objective of facilitation is to understand the personalities of those you are facilitating and guide them to the point of being able to function together on their own.
- Michelle summarized the question as being that of the Officers now presiding over the Committee meetings, and the facilitators being welcome to attend any part of the Committee meetings they wish to, or that is appropriate or for which they are contracted, but specifically to work with the Committee on the agenda.

The Committee agreed by consensus that the Committee should function with the Officers presiding over the Committee meetings, with the facilitators being welcome anytime during the meetings but specifically being present to work with the Committee on CPAC meeting agendas.

6. Proposed Agenda

The agenda subjects and sequence for the March 11 CPAC meeting were discussed, resulting in the following proposed agenda to be sent to the facilitators:

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|
| I. | Welcome and Overview | |
| | New Ground Rule: Meeting Decorum | |
| II. | Introductions | |
| III. | Verification of CPAC Election Results | |
| IV. | Approval of the February 12, 2008 CPAC Meeting Summary | |
| V. | Vision Statement | 60 minutes |
| | A. Visioning Process Methodology | |
| | B. Preliminary Vision Input | |
| | C. Vision Statement Consensus Building | |
| VI. | OHA Headquarters Presentation and Q&A - Jonathan Scheuer | 30 minutes |
| | A. Office Building and Community Center | (to be confirmed) |
| | B. Relationship with Kaka'ako Makai Land Agreement | |
| VII. | Steering Committee Transition | |
| | A. Steering Committee Recommendation | |
| | B. Other | |
| VIII. | Next Meeting Steps | |
| | A. Next Meeting Dates | |
| | B. Kewalo Keiki Fishing Conservancy Presentation | |
| | C. Kewalo Boaters Presentation (subject to confirmation) | |
| | D. Finalize Vision Statement | |
| | E. Draft Guiding Principles | |
| | F. Additional Suggestions | |

Note: This meeting may be extended to complete the agenda.