

# Charter Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

Honolulu Hale • 530 South King Street • Honolulu, Hawaii 96813



## THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEETING ROOM HONOLULU HALE MINUTES

### Charter Commission Members Present:

Jesse Souki, Chair  
David W. Rae, Vice Chair  
Judge Michael F. Broderick (Ret.)  
Reginald V. Castanares, Jr.  
Donna Ikeda  
Kevin Mulligan

Nathan T. Okubo  
Paul T. Oshiro  
Edlyn S. Taniguchi  
Governor John D. Waihee III  
Pamela Witty-Oakland

### Charter Commission Members Absent/Excused:

Guy K. Fujimura  
Cheryl D. Soon

R. Brian Tsujimura

### Others Present:

James Wataru, Fire Commission Chair  
Ronald Taketa, Police Commission Chair  
Cha Thompson, Police Commission Vice Chair  
Max Sword, Police Commission Commissioner  
Major Clyde Ho, Professional Standards Office, Honolulu Police Department  
Derek T. Mayeshiro, Deputy Corporation Counsel  
Linda Luli Nakasone Oamilda, Executive Administrator, Honolulu Charter Commission  
Mary James, Research Analyst, Honolulu Charter Commission  
Norma Reyes, Secretary, Honolulu Charter Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER

*Roll Call*

With a quorum present, Chair Souki convened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

II. CHAIR'S REPORT

There was no Chair's Report.

III. EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

*Status report on the scheduling and potential subject matter focus of future meetings.*

The Executive Administrator noted that the next two meetings are scheduled for October 15 and 28 at 3:30pm in the Committee Meeting Room at Honolulu Hale. Topics suggested for upcoming meetings include the Board of Water Supply (BWS), Ethics Commission, Salary Commission, Planning Commission, and Transportation Commission. Also, commission-related topics suggested to date include amending the Charter Commission Rules, modifying the calendar to accommodate late proposals, reviewing and modifying the committee structure, including adding subject-specific committees or Permitted Interactive Groups (P.I.G.s) on climate change and environment. Tentative dates set aside include November 6, 16, and 30. November 3 was removed per last meeting. Additional tentative dates include December 10 and 17 for meetings.

Publicity: Commissioner Mulligan volunteered to be on "The Conversation" with Chris Vandercook on Hawaii Public Radio next Friday. Flyers were distributed to Neighborhood Commissions for distribution to their boards (a copy of the flyer is in the binders provided to the commissioners). An email reminder about the proposal deadline and submittal information was sent to the City Council members and department executives. Laura Figueira, Executive Assistant to Chair Martin, reminded senior advisors to the Council members about the proposal submittal deadline. In addition, ads were placed in Pacific Business News, Star-Advertiser, and MidWeek which should be coming out shortly. The Chamber of Commerce and its affiliates and good government groups such as the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, etc. were also emailed about the proposal submittal deadline.

To date, eight proposals have been received online compared to only five received by October 7, 2005 by the 2005-2006 Charter Commission. More are expected soon.

Chair Souki requested suggestions on future agenda items and restructuring for discussion by the Commission during the Discussion section of this meeting.

Upon questioning from Chair Souki regarding public outreach, the Executive Administrator responded that the Commission is ahead of the game. She explained that the Olelo broadcast

will start in November and will be for six meetings here and possibly one meeting outside. The tentative cost is about \$7,000 for Olelo broadcasts of those meetings. The high cost is due to the Federal Communications Commission requirements for closed captioning.

#### IV. INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

*Under section 15-105 of the Revised Charter of the City and County of Honolulu 1973, as amended (“Charter”), the Charter Commission is required “to study and review the operation of the government of the city under [the current] charter” every ten years. The Commission has invited departments, agencies, and offices of the City to a series of public meetings to present how they operate under the Charter and to discuss potential Charter amendments or revisions that may improve City government operations. Today’s briefings continue this process and include presentations from the:*

- *Honolulu Fire Commission*
- *Honolulu Police Commission*

Chair Souki advised James Wataru and Ronald Taketa of the intent and purpose of the briefing and the process.

#### **HONOLULU FIRE COMMISSION**

Mr. Wataru, Commission Chair, appeared before the Commission to speak only for himself and not for the other fire commissioners. He explained the Honolulu Fire Commission’s (HFC’s) responsibilities as they are published in the Charter. These are basically to hire and, if necessary, to remove the Fire Chief; review the Honolulu Fire Department (HFD) and its budget; submit an annual report; and review the Fire Chief at least annually. The job of the HFC is easier than that of the Honolulu Police Commission (HPC) because HFC does not handle investigation of complaints on firefighters. In reality, there are very few complaints against fire fighters and most of those are about the use of sirens at night and similar issues. The HFC meets once a month.

Commissioner Rae inquired about the possibility of a five-year contract for the Fire Chief. Mr. Wataru understands it has to be on the ballot, and he would go back to the HFC to discuss that possibility.

Commissioner Broderick requested confirmation on whether or not the HFC receives complaints. Mr. Wataru clarified that most complaints do not go directly to the Commission, but will go to HFD and the Fire Chief can then refer a complaint to the HFC. The HFC can only make a recommendation on how to address it and he reiterated that there are very few negative complaints made.

## **HONOLULU POLICE COMMISSION**

Mr. Taketa, Honolulu Police Commission (HPC) Chair, introduced Vice Chair Cha Thompson and Commissioner Max Sword. Major Clyde Ho was also available to answer specific questions relating to the work of the Professional Standards Office (PSO), Honolulu Police Department's (HPD's) current version of internal affairs. He noted that they received very specific questions from the Charter Commission and would therefore explain the functions of the HPC in the context of responses to those questions.

**Question 1:** Regarding the types of complaints investigated by HPC, Mr. Taketa explained that HPC investigates all types of citizen complaints regarding police misconduct. The complaints fall into two general areas – conduct complaints and use-of-force complaints. Conduct complaints usually involve: discourtesy where an officer refuses to provide a name and badge; alleged use of profanity; overbearing conduct (officer perceived to be arrogant or intimidating, or invading complainant's personal space); conduct unbecoming (acting inappropriately or unprofessionally or not being as helpful as the officer should be). Use-of-force complaints include unnecessary use of force (grabbing, pushing, spraying with pepper spray, or Taser use); excessive use of force (handcuffs too tight, hard strikes, knee on the person's back while the person is on the ground, or arm lock). Mistreatment or malicious use of force generally involves a complainant already subdued and in handcuffs and includes rough handling (struck or pushed down or against a car or building) after being restrained and while complying.

Mr. Taketa said that HPC has a civilian staff of eight: one executive officer, three civilian investigators, a secretary, two police reporters and one clerk typist. He then explained HPC procedure for a complaint made within 60 days of an incident: the complainant files a notarized written statement which is assigned to an investigator; the investigator then helps the complainant identify the officer(s) involved, get witness names, interview all civilian witnesses who were at the scene and the named officer and other officers to corroborate incident. The officer involved may submit a written or oral rebuttal. Interviews are transcribed and given to the police commissioners for consideration at the next HPC meeting. Four commissioners are required to make one of four decisions: 1) vote to sustain the complaint; 2) exonerate the officer(s) finding that the incident occurred but they believe the officer(s) acted properly under the circumstances; 3) not sustained which means they don't know what happened – this usually occurs when incidents are one on one so the commissioners are unable to confirm or deny the allegations or rebuttal which means there is no preponderance of the evidence and so the complaint cannot be sustained; 4) unfounded which generally occurs when the named officer was found not to be at the scene of the incident.

If a complaint is sustained, it is referred to the HPD through the Police Chief who then assigns it to the PSO. The PSO investigates completely and independently and after it has finished the

investigation, the case is sent to Administrative Review Board (ARB) composed of assistant chiefs and two deputy chiefs. The ARB considers the case and may hear testimony from the officer. If the ARB agrees with HPC, the Police Chief will determine the appropriate disciplinary action. HPD may reverse a sustainment of the HPC.

The second part of this question asks if the HPD or HPC investigates the most egregious cases. Mr. Taketa explained that HPC investigates all cases brought by the public against police officers regardless of severity. HPD, through PSO, reinvestigates all sustained complaints. In actuality, most of serious cases go the civil suit route, bypassing the HPC completely.

HPC handles all citizen complaints against police personnel. PSO investigates all internal and external cases which are not investigated by HPC, such as cases centered on operational lines, policies, violation of standards of conduct, etc. (for example, if an officer did not show up in court, filed incomplete or incorrect report, falsified overtime records, was insubordinate, committed spousal abuse, or was arrested for driving under the influence) relating to duty and image within the community. If the HPC and PSO get complaints not related to them, the complaints are forwarded to the correct agency.

**Question 2:** This question concerns a statement by the Acting Executive Officer that there is little the HPC can do if HPD ignores its findings and HPC's powers are limited by the Charter. Mr. Taketa assured the commissioners that HPD does not ignore the HPC and the HPC is not powerless as implied. The HPC's influence on HPD is through the Police Chief who is appointed by the HPC for a renewable five-year term with annual evaluations. One of the five categories of the evaluation includes the Police Chief's relationship to the HPC, the Police Chief's responsiveness to the HPC, and the Police Chief's cooperation with the HPC in providing requested information, amounting to 20% of the evaluation. The Honolulu Charter prohibits the HPC from interfering with administrative or operational matters of HPD which include employee discipline. There are very few reversals by HPD - anywhere from none to two annually. When HPD reverses a sustained case, HPD is required to appear before the HPC and justify the reversal with a full report. Justification helps the HPC improve its investigative process and educates the commissioners.

**Second part of Question 2:** This question relates to assurances that an investigation is fair, objective, and thorough under the current structure. Mr. Taketa explained that if a case is sustained, HPD does its own complete investigation. The Police Chief regularly reports to HPC on all cases, including those handled by PSO, so HPC reviews all disciplinary actions. The HPC process is comparable to the criminal justice system with checks and balances with the HPC similar to a grand jury.

**Question 3:** Mr. Taketa explained that this question relates to possible civilian oversight of law enforcement as in other jurisdictions. All civilian oversight models researched, have equal

or less authority than HPC. HPC also has more influence than neighbor island counties whose Police Chiefs are appointed for life. HPC was created in response to the 1932 Massey case in an effort to remove political influence from law enforcement in Honolulu. He thought that even though some civilian oversight models may seem more appealing, the HPC has found that other jurisdictions are following Honolulu's model.

Chair Souki noted that people are concerned that discipline is determined by HPD and not by an impartial third party. Mr. Taketa responded that the Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), the Charter and union agreements all say that the employer can discipline for just cause. He explained that HPC is not the employer, HPD is the employer. If the Commission wants to change this provision, then HRS, the Charter and union agreements would have to be changed. Due to the size of HPD, HPC does not have the human resource infrastructure necessary to discipline. PSO has 22 sworn officers and six civilian employees. He pointed out that it would be extremely difficult for the volunteer commissioners on HPC to be involved in disciplinary actions, including the grievance process.

Chair Souki asked if this were more of a policy question. He questioned whether issues such as personnel hiring practices, not doing work, and not filling out forms, should be distinguished from conduct charges brought by the public. He inquired who determines what is treated as a personnel decision. Mr. Taketa responded that any volunteer review board is not an employer and therefore doesn't have the authority to discipline. Any influence by an outside agency like HPC would be grounds for reversal of the imposed discipline. The employer needs to conduct its own thorough independent investigation.

Chair Souki wanted to confirm that the public could go straight to court and they are not required to go through HPC first. Mr. Taketa confirmed that there is no requirement to go through HPC, and that any complainant can go straight to court.

Commissioner Mulligan said he is concerned that the process still leaves the decision of discipline in response to a citizen complaint to HPD with no outside input. He pointed out that the Los Angeles Inspector General oversight has subpoena powers and reports to its police commission. His concern is that the HPC does not have subpoena powers and there is no objective third party for review. Therefore, ultimately HPD decides discipline, and people have no recourse when nothing happens in high profile cases of police misconduct. The issue is the lack of objective analysis, and holding people accountable. He pointed out that the power wielded by police officers puts them into a totally different category from other public employees. Mr. Taketa responded that just cause requires a complete investigation or there will be a basis for reversal. In his experience, there has never been a need for subpoena power as the Inspector General has. HPD has always been cooperative and produced everything requested by the HPC. The HPC reviews all cases every month that come before PSO. Some of the newer commissions may be more adversarial in nature and therefore, subpoena powers

are needed. But the working relationship here is different. Commissioner Mulligan noted that mainland responsibilities of the commission and the board are separate from the investigative arm, making Honolulu different in that regard. Mr. Taketa noted that in a lot of jurisdictions, the police chief is appointed by the mayor, not the police commission. Commissioner Mulligan feels that there is a problem but is not sure where it is and how it can be addressed, but it is worth looking into. Both agreed that the HRS ban on releasing the names of disciplined officers causes problems and prevents closure of the situation. Mr. Taketa pointed out the situation of a disciplined officer's children and family that might be difficult for them to handle.

Commissioner Broderick read from an article in Civil Beat that stated that Hawaii is the "only state without a police standards board responsible for police training or law enforcement standards, practice, and procedures." He asked if that was correct. Major Clyde Ho responded that there is no training and standards board; that Hawaii is the only state that leaves it up to the counties to create their own training programs. Commissioner Broderick asked how to reconcile that Honolulu is a model with the fact that Hawaii is the only state with no standards process. Mr. Taketa responded that was from a standpoint of civilian oversight and not necessarily from training standards. He noted that HPD is certified by the Commission for Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) which certifies police departments internationally. Mr. Taketa did not have an opinion on whether or not Hawaii should have a police standards board, saying he would have to look into it. As to certification by CALEA, which is voluntary, HPD standards would not change if it were not certified. CALEA certification is every three years.

Commissioner Rae believes that the behavior of police comes down to whether it is criminal or not and that the overall issue is one of the credibility of HPD to the public. Much of the credibility of HPD lies with the Police Chief. He asked Mr. Taketa if he thought the Mayor should be more involved in the hiring of the Police Chief or have no involvement at all. Mr. Taketa explained that in his opinion elected officials should not be involved in the hiring process for the Police Chief. He returned to the basis for creating the HPC which was to remove politics from law enforcement. If that course were to be reversed, there would have to be agreement to reverse that underlying basis to change the current structure. In the annual review of the Police Chief, public perception or credibility of HPD is one of the five criteria used for evaluation which are leadership, managerial, financial management of HPD, relationship with the Police Commission, and relationship with the public.

Commissioner Ikeda inquired how the Police Chief is judged on that. Mr. Taketa responded that evaluation is based on reports required by HPC and an analysis of his decision-making process on various issues that arise during the year. Commissioner Ikeda questioned how HPC judges those situations that become public and are not resolved to the public's satisfaction or to the public's knowledge. Mr. Taketa responded that just because the issue becomes public or is

not resolved to the public's satisfaction does not mean that HPD handled it incorrectly. Commissioner Ikeda said she fails to see the objectivity in the evaluation when the person being evaluated is writing the evaluation. Mr. Taketa answered that all the commissioners do a very good job in voting their conscience when evaluating the Police Chief.

Commissioner Fujimura inquired about the overall process and whether there are internal time limits for each step of the process. Mr. Taketa responded that generally there are not, but they have a log to track all the cases and can see where they are and what, if anything is causing the delay. From there they can keep track of all the cases and see where adjustments can be made to complete the investigation. Major Ho explained the various situations which may arise to delay the process and how they respond to each, noting that it's a good tracking system.

Commissioner Fujimura inquired about the public's access to this information in redacted form. Mr. Taketa said there is no such version. He then continued on to a handout with statistics on dispositions of the cases. Discharge of a firearm is within the purview of the HPD as operational and therefore these actions are administratively reviewed, regardless of injury.

Commissioner Fujimura noted that TV court and police cases are resolved in one hour which gives the public a warped sense of time and therefore people need assurance that cases are moving and are eventually resolved in some form which would impact public confidence.

Commissioner Mulligan asked if the police commissioners see repeated types of complaints about officer behavior, a pattern of behavior, can the HPC make recommendations to HPD. He noted that HPC may see things that HPD doesn't. Mr. Taketa said that when he started on the HPC, it received about 290 cases a year, sustaining about 4% of the cases. Now they get about 120 cases per year which is about a 60% reduction and about 12-18% of the cases are sustained. The numbers have been consistently low due to improvement in training by HPD for recruits and recall training of all officers. HPC uses complaints as a barometer of community perception to help police improve its community image and support.

Commissioner Broderick inquired about term limits for members of HPC. Mr. Taketa explained that the maximum is two terms and that he served from 1989 to 1999, left for two years, and then served again for five years.

Commissioner Ikeda inquired about HPC's authority to hire the Fire Chief for a five-year term. Mr. Taketa explained that Honolulu previously hired the Fire Chief with no term limit. He felt that while the Fire Chief could be fired for cause, mediocre performance did not rise to that level and he could not be fired for that reason. He worked with Councilmember Yoshimura to change to a five-year renewable term. He feels that this makes the Fire Chief more accountable and that this will encourage the Fire Chief to perform at a higher level throughout



his tenure, and it would also keep him closer to HFC and accountable if he wanted a reappointment.

Commissioner Ikeda noted the reduction in complaints and wondered if there were anything done to protect the identity of the complainant. The name is not made public but the officer needs to know the complainant's name to defend himself. She recounted that as a legislator she received many complaints from people who had repeated incidents with police. Often the person was afraid to file a complaint because of fear of retaliation. She wondered how the public is protected since the police have access to personal information, pointing out how hard it is to prove retaliation. She also noted that complaints may be going down because people are not complaining for other reasons.

Commissioner Fujimura inquired whether there are procedures and safeguards to counteract the image of "protecting your own" or favoritism. Major Ho responded that this would fall on HPD and more so on the Police Chief as to corrective action. He explained that it is the supervisor's duty is to prevent such situations so the Police Chief can take action against the supervisor. Regarding Commissioner Fujimura's inquiry about redacting, he explained that the legislature requires HPD to report at the end of the calendar year – suspensions, terminations and a brief summary of those actions. Last year, the law changed requiring it to be posted and where it's at; and the Legislature posts the report online, including summaries of the various incidents.

There was no testimony.

## V. DISCUSSION

Chair Souki asked the Executive Administrator to review the list of issues for upcoming meetings. The Executive Administrator said these included the Board of Water Supply, Ethics Commission, Salary Commission, Planning Commission, and Transportation Commission. The Bond Counsel was also suggested but that would be very expensive and the Charter Commission probably could not afford it. Other suggested topics included amending the rules or modifying the calendar to accommodate late proposals, and reviewing and possibly modifying the committee structure to add subject-specific committees (e.g. Climate change in environment).

Commissioner Rae asked how proposals from the commissioners would be handled. Chair Souki responded that they should all come in by the deadline to be taken up with all of the other proposals. The Executive Administrator put the schedule on the website.

Commissioner Rae then inquired about the form of the proposals. Chair Souki said it can be in "short form" like the legislature. The Commission can then discuss it, and the proposal can be

referred to an agency. Commissioner Rae noted that he spoke to Jim Williston who has been with the Office of Council Services (OCS) a long time. They discussed that there is a lot in the Charter that is not necessary and can be weeded out. Mr. Williston said that if the Commission asked OCS to clean it up, they would do that.

Commissioner Broderick asked if the staff could categorize the proposals received to date. Chair Souki thought maybe a matrix would be helpful. He said he intends to group the agendas that way so they are coherent.

Chair Rae asked if the proposals received so far were anonymous or not. The Executive Administrator responded that two of them were anonymous. Chair Souki felt that the substance of the proposal was most important and not so much who submitted it. Commissioner Ikeda thought the discussion earlier was that proposals should not be anonymous without good reason, but that comments could be anonymous. Chair Souki felt that if something was submitted anonymously, it showed that the person is not willing to defend it. He hopes people who submit proposals will come to a meeting to talk about their proposals and put them in perspective and share their research.

Commissioner Fujimura inquired how proposals will be handled. He thought that all proposals would be considered regardless of whether the proposer included his or her name. He felt that the Commission could regroup and rewrite the proposals as necessary. He felt that all proposals should be considered. If the submitter provided contact information, then the Commission would be able to contact them if the Commission has any questions. He also noted that none of the departments or independent groups mentioned any housekeeping measures.

Commissioner Ikeda mentioned that the Prosecuting Attorney pointed out that several of the provisions in the Charter were obsolete and that the Commission should address these.

Commissioner Broderick confirmed with the Executive Administrator that staff would follow-up on all the recommendations made to the Commission. She confirmed that a matrix was presented early on and will be updated for the Commission.

Commissioner Ikeda recommended that the Commission should amend its rules to combine the Personnel and Budget Committees since there are no personnel issues right now since they are fully staffed. In lieu of this committee they could create new committees such as a committee on climate change. Chair Souki noted that he is working with community experts on climate change to make proposals on the climate change issue. Commissioner Ikeda felt that a committee of commissioners should discuss this issue. Chair Souki responded that these issues will be on future agendas so the community and the Commission will be aware of the issues and the Commission will have a say on them. Commissioner Ikeda stated further that the

reason she suggested a committee is because the sunshine law mandates that no more than two commissioners may discuss an issue at a time. A committee would offer a whole different perspective for that discussion. Chair Souki invited the commissioners to let the Executive Administrator know if they want any new committees to be considered at the next meeting so she can put the suggestions on the agenda. Commissioner Fujimura clarified the process for the new committees. Chair Souki and Commissioner Fujimura reviewed the process for proposals.

Chair Souki asked the commissioners if they wanted to hear from any more commissions or agencies, or hear again from any of them. Commissioner Ikeda questioned the impression she got from the Honolulu Authority Rapid Transit (HART) that they would phase out after the construction of the project is completed. Pointing out the Charter amendment that the public voted on, she said she thought that the semiautonomous agency would be around for operation and maintenance also. She said that the key question in terms of policy in relation to the Charter is whether or not HART will take the lead into the future and manage, run, and oversee the operation as opposed to fading off once the system is built. Commissioner Fujimura commented on HART, that unintended consequences are that raising the money and building the project are not connected. She said that the public wanted something not tied into politics, so they voted for and got HART. At the end, the public ends up paying the bill. Throughout the various presentations for the Commission, the cost and budget are not connected to the policy which raises concerns. In terms of transportation and HART, it's more connected to the operations of TheBus. TheBus is appended to HART and HART has a master plan for one ticket, but MTL (the old HRT) people don't say anything. There seems to be no enthusiasm for the one-system project. But he said it is difficult to predict if the Commission can solve the problem structurally.

Commissioner Fujimura noted that the Commission deals with the structure of government at the Charter level. Through all of the presentations there are certain areas of disconnect that seem to have arisen that the Commission needs to deal with. Climate change presents similar issues. He said that the Mayor is already initiating a \$200,000,000 program to deal with some of the expected results of climate change. The question for the Commission is whether it can put something in the Charter that will codify that. He said that they probably can but that it will be difficult because of zoning and various projects, bike paths being a prime example. He pointed out the difficulties involved with addressing infrastructure in relation to climate change. He said it's one thing to deal with anticipated flooding, but another thing to deal with infrastructure that will be flooded such as the sewers and the water system. The question becomes whether to put something in the Charter to deal with all these different areas. The Charter provides the blueprint for the City to follow, but it should leave the decision-making process to the City Council and the Mayor. He noted the difficulty in deciding what language should be put into the Charter and what would be more appropriate in the ordinances. Another challenge becomes how to define committees to cover all the issues. Commissioner Fujimura

also noted the difference between preamble language and specific language. His major issues involve minimum wage, homelessness and similar issues and thought the Charter's preamble could be amended to include those along with climate change but the implementation level is also important.

Commissioner Rae noted that he will be submitting 3-5 proposals. He anticipates that there will be packages of proposals from the administration. He also expects to receive proposals from HART, the City Council, and others.

Commissioner Ikeda felt that if the language in the Charter is the framework for government and it is too broad, such as the language for HART, it will be ignored. The provisions need to have some specificity. She said the bottom line is that time is needed to discuss these issues and come up with new ideas, and that's why she feels there should be committees for specific issues. Commissioner Fujimura feels that the challenge will be how many committees will be needed to cover all the issues. Chair Souki was willing to defer to the Commission's wishes but felt that having committees will double the work load for the commissioners and that the work could be accomplished under the current structure. There will be meetings to address all the agenda items and they can dedicate meetings to certain topic areas if they receive enough proposals in a topic area. Those will become working meetings.

#### VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

*The next meeting date is to be determined.*

The Executive Administrator told the commissioners that the next meeting would be on October 15<sup>th</sup> and asked if they would like any boards or commissions invited to speak. Commissioner Ikeda brought up the issue of whether all of the boards and commissions are still needed and suggested that discussion as an agenda item for the next meeting. Chair Souki asked the commissioners if any agencies need to be on the agenda since the commission is still in the fact-finding stage. Commissioner Ikeda suggested that all of the boards and commissions be told that the Commission is considering deleting their commission and that might encourage them to show up. Chair Souki said that the agenda is open for suggestions and the Commission will continue with the fact-finding meetings.

Commissioner Ikeda emphasized that October 31<sup>st</sup> is the deadline to submit proposals without the need for a supermajority and that the final deadline is the end of November.

#### VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.