

CHARTER COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 10, 1992
COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM/MAYOR'S LOUNGE

PRESENT

James Cockett
Dolores Fabrao
Victor Reyes
Allan Sparks (Meeting Chair)
Anne Takabuki
Jamie Woodburn
Deborah Wright
Susan Nakano-Ruidas (Staff)
Paul Mancini (Charter Counsel)

EXCUSED

Sherrilee Dodson (Vice Chair)
Annette Mondoy
Robert Nakasone (Chairman)
Lloyd Yonenaka

GUESTS

Dave DeLeon
Brian Perry (The Maui News)

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting recessed on August 6, 1992 was reconvened at 11:14 a.m. in the Council Committee Room. Because this room was unavailable for the Charter Commission's use, the meeting was recessed at 11:15 a.m. and reconvened at 11:21 a.m. in the Mayor's Lounge, 9th Floor, Kalana O Maui Building.

Allan Sparks was unanimously chosen as the meeting chairman by all commissioners present.

II. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF FINAL REPORT DRAFT

Sparks: The major order of business was to go over Paul's last draft...and he was hoping that some of you would have done it and given it to him before now, but perhaps you didn't -- like I didn't.

Mancini: Let me suggest that...two things that we do; one is if everyone's gotten the theoretical final report in a binder like this...there were only a very few changes. The most significant change, if you would go to page 45 of the new booklet, was the narrative that tries to tie together the new prohibition section -- the prohibition on officers and employees appearing on behalf of private interests before county agencies. I retained the questions that were in the last draft, and you will see those questions ending into the middle of the first paragraph on page 45...and then I drafted the new narrative to try to tie in what you voted on at the last session. I said also..."The Charter Commission is also concerned that if the electorate accepts the Commission's proposal with regard to the Lanai Planning Commission that adequate flexibility be given to the Lanai Commission so that they can properly conduct their business. Such flexibility may not be available under the current Charter." That was included. "The Commission has proposed what it believes is a practical approach to the issues. It is proposing that members of boards and commissions can represent private interests before county agencies in which they do not serve, or agencies that do not act on or review the same matters on which the board or commission member serves. This proposal also allows county officers and employees to seek redress against county action affecting their personal rights and privileges. The Commission is retaining the existing broad prohibition as it relates to the county officers and full time county employees, but is also creating some flexibility by authorizing the council to legislate in this area without amending the standards created by the Commission in the proposal."

Then I go on to state what you voted on last time. So, that's the narrative change. I'll give you a second to look at it and then if anybody wants any changes to that, obviously that can be done easily.

CHARTER COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 10, 1992 - MAYOR'S LOUNGE

Page 2

Sparks: I noticed a couple of typo things under your actual wording for 10-4 prohibitions; down in the next to the last line, I think it means...it should be person serves, not persons.

Mancini: Right.

Sparks: And then the one we caught before is still in there...the fourth to the last word should be...

Takabuki: It's correct.

Sparks: Oh, yeah, okay...it's supposed to have an s.

Mancini: And the other change that was a bit of a change was the salary commission, where we wanted to make it clear that the board of water supply was losing its ability to set the salary of the water director. If you go to page 13; if you look at the beginning of the last sentence, it merely states "It is the intent of the Charter Commission that the salary commission establishes the salaries of the director and the deputy director of the department of water supply; consequently Section 8-11.4 of the Charter concerning the powers, duties and functions of the board of water supply would be amended to delete the board's power to fix the director's salary. The revised section will read as follows..." and then I just state that; everything else is the same there.

Sparks: This is a good example of another concern we had before about how are we going to indicate these changes. At some point, it seems to me, we have to have the brackets and the underlines.

Mancini: You can do that; what I've done is all the changes in the back section here. Now, I think you may set up a committee when you do your committee on the ballot question to get that done. If you want me to work on that when I get back, but obviously it's obviously not something that's going to get done by the 15th.

Sparks: And, the clerk will accept this as definitive of what the changes are even though it doesn't clearly say what words are left out and which ones are added?

Wright: It shows the amendment in full, so that...you're right, it doesn't do what you're talking about, but this should tell him exactly what's changed.

Mancini: What you're looking to do is like what you would do in an ordinance...which basically shows where something is deleted and it shows where it's added. That method is not necessary; I think the council may have provided an ordinance, so when they do ordinances they may have adopted that method. You're not obligated, but I think your point is well taken because what we've got here is we've got the sections and if you want to be very thorough, you also follow it up with that method. It takes a bit of time.

Sparks: I was just thinking about anybody that wants to know what we did change...if they read one of these things, it's not real clear what's new and what's deleted.

Mancini: The public, basically, wouldn't understand it...underline your new material and deleted materials by a bracket, et cetera. It doesn't hurt you to do that; it's helpful to do it...

Sparks: Before when I was doing this, we printed the whole new charter as revised with the new words in bold print so people could glance through there and knew immediately

CHARTER COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 10, 1992 - MAYOR'S LOUNGE

Page 3

Sparks: what was new would stand out; we didn't put in deleted things...this was to the public...a tabloid to the public. I actually prefer doing that because I know that most of the public's not going to read it that close, but there are some out there that want to, and it should be available to them -- very clear what we changed, I think.

Wright: Well, that may be a good idea for, like Paul was saying, that committee to do to get it ready for publication.

Mancini: I'm not sure that it isn't something that you should just go ask Corp Counsel to do; I'm just trying to be cost-effective. In my mind, it makes not sense to pay me to do something as ministerial as that....

Sparks: Speaking of ministerial, we agreed then that the degendering -- we'll just stay with that little paragraph at the end of it? And have all this mayor he and mayor stuff still in there?

Mancini: If there's anything that I've done here, I always did he or she...he/she....

Sparks: Somebody said there's a provision in there somewhere. I know the last Charter people took credit for something like that.

Takabuki: 13-15. "When any personal pronoun appears in this Charter it shall be construed to mean either sex."

Sparks: I see; they did it that way instead of going through the whole thing.

Mancini: The other change I did...I took out Kahoolawe, as it was wisely pointed out by Ed Tanji. But I think...it's my recollection that that's all of any substantive change.

Sparks: Anybody have any other comments on this? If we do come up with something now, what's the procedure going to be while you're gone?

Mancini: Marilyn (Alexander) in my office has this on a word processor; I've got the original here. I'm going to give the original back to Marilyn and then I'm going to call from the mainland probably at the end of this week to see what you did on Thursday. And then I'm going to try to coordinate from the mainland any changes you made on Thursday in a final version, and I'll coordinate with Sue a letter from Bob to the clerk, to the mayor and to the council for the submission.

Wright: That's going to take place on Friday?

Mancini: Well, I understand that you're going to meet on Thursday, so I'm not going to know what you've done on Thursday as to whether any changes will be made until Friday, so I'll call from the mainland on Friday.

Wright: But, I understand our report has to be in on Friday, is that right?

Sparks: Right.

Mancini: Is Friday the 15th?

Takabuki: The 15th is Saturday, so it couldn't be until Monday.

Mancini: Oh, so it's Monday.

[Staff: I double checked with Corp Counsel and he said it had to be in on Friday the 14th.]

Sparks: So, Friday; we'll get it in by Friday.

Wright: That's why I wanted to be clear; just so we were all clear before Paul left, about what had to be....

[Staff: I asked Guy Haywood and he said the 14th.]

Mancini: Sue, could you do the letters of transmittal for Bob to the clerk, the council and the mayor, and have Bob sign them Thursday? I've got this report here and there are a few changes; I'm going to have Marilyn do these and have this in your hand by Thursday. If there are no changes, then you can walk it up on Thursday. If there are changes, then we'll try it again.

Now Allan, under the board of water supply on page 37, brought up a typo...that the board was semi-autonomous 1960-1977, not 1970...so I'll make that change. There was a few editorial-grammatical things that he pointed out which I've got here. Is there...on page 52 I've got 53 meetings -- with your meeting on Thursday that will make it 54, so I'll make that change. On page 46 I'll make that change from persons to person. Dolores, you said you found a few things?

Fabrao: You know, I thought I'd marked them, but I can't find the markings now.

Mancini: Anne, how about you?

Takabuki: Just this one here about the transfer of the water department property. The department holds property in its own name, doesn't it, as a semi-autonomous agency?

Mancini: We're not changing that.

Takabuki: But I think that was an old section prior to when it was semi-autonomous... when it was under the county; that is my only question there.

Mancini: I think this would have been obviated in the '88 report, with the transitional provision in the '88 report.

Takabuki: Okay, so you think when they re-do it, it's going to be changed?

Mancini: This came about in '83. Anne's question under section 13-3., page 39 in the Charter...Title to Property; it says "Upon the retirement of all bonded indebtedness of the department of water supply, all rights, title and interests entered into any real property held in the name of the board shall be promptly transferred and conveyed to the county." This section was adopted when the board of water supply was apparently not autonomous and didn't have title to its property. But, there were existing bonds which provided security in that property to the bond holder; so, this was a transitional provision in the Charter when the board went from autonomous to a county department... and it wasn't deleted. The point I made is that in the '88 Charter...because this Charter is really the 1983 Charter...with the amendments of '88 in here...it just seems like they didn't accommodate the amendment, but it would have been taken care of by the transitional provisions in the '88 Charter. For you to deal with this, I would not think it's wise; because it would just confuse people.

Sparks: It doesn't mean anything, but it doesn't hurt. This is...for sure Thursday will be the last meeting at which we'll have enough people to do any last minute votes

CHARTER COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 10, 1992 - MAYOR'S LOUNGE

Page 5

Sparks: (Continued) and reconsiderations. I would encourage you to think about that; if you think there's something that slipped by us and we need to rethink, Thursday's going to be the last chance. I have a few of those items, myself, I'd like to just put out for information and for you to think about before we get together on Thursday. Does anybody have any others?

Mancini: I just want to give the last call for any editorial or typos or anything that anyone's found here.

Wright: I gave mine last time; I gave you a few typos I find last time.

Mancini: Did you?

Wright: Yes, but I haven't had a chance to...I have to go back and find my old copy to go and put it against the new one, Paul.

Mancini: You don't have the old one with you here?

Wright: I don't think so; I've got this one but I don't think it's the one I had written on with the typing problems.

Sparks: Typos we can call into Marilyn (Alexander).

Mancini: Yeah, except if you have it now...

Wright: It's better. I may just call you later when I get back to my office because I've got the other one there.

Reyes: I still have concerns about the qualifications of the prosecuting attorney and the corp counsel...being in the practice of law for three years anywhere in the United States. I know in the previous provision, those three years must have been practiced in the State of Hawaii. Looking at the different qualifications of various department heads, there is a standard five year experience required of them. So, I would say if we are going to recommend that the practice of law is not limited to the State of Hawaii, then we should up it to five years instead of three years practicing law anywhere in the United States.

Sparks: That's an interesting one; does anyone know the origin of three years for that when it's five for everything else?

Reyes: The reason it was three years there probably was because it had to be practiced in the State of Hawaii; but you removed State of Hawaii so I would think three years practicing law anywhere in the United States...you know, for such a position as important to the county as it is.

Sparks: Well, you've thrown that one out; people can think about it.

Cockett: Question; by graduating, getting a diploma and going to the prosecutor's office for three years -- is that the qualification, too?

Mancini: I think the only qualification...

Sparks: Is the practice of law.

CHARTER COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 10, 1992 - MAYOR'S LOUNGE

Page 6

Mancini: ...is the fact that you've got a license in the State.

Wright: And you've practiced law for at least three years.

Mancini: Practiced law anywhere for three years.

Wright: Yes.

Reyes: I have serious concern about that; that's too...

Sparks: That might be one you can bring out on Thursday again.

Reyes: You might want to think about it because if you look at the departments, they have a five year, more or less, standard.

Sparks: Let me just explain briefly the ones I want to bring up on Thursday, or somebody else may have to bring up... Roberts Rules of Order, I think, require that somebody who's on the prevailing side has to move for reconsideration; and, since that's where we are on these sorts of things, we have to probably follow that. And, with a couple of these, I've already been on the non-prevailing side -- somebody else is going to have to move for reconsideration.

Woodburn: On Thursday, you mean?

Sparks: On Thursday. This Kahului one failed last time; I'm thinking perhaps people didn't understand the way it happened and what line we're talking about. Make sure you take a good close look at this map before you leave. When I left on my vacation we were using census tract lines, and that line was like this. When Daryl tried to duplicate it to precincts, he translated it into this line. What I would like us to do is correct that more like what it was before, which puts the line between these fairly open spaces, pretty much. It's this little precinct here...it would go west, and this one would go also, so that all these...Puuone, Sand Hills and all the way up to the County Building would indeed be in Wailuku. It puts the line in a more logical place between residential areas. That's that one; it's a much cleaner, much goofier line.

The other one several of us were concerned about was this precinct here, which includes now most of Waikapu and Maalaea. It is currently...well, the way Daryl had it, it's all part of South Maui... I did find a gulch -- Pohakea Gulch -- that is used actually for boundaries in census tract maps; a very clear demarcation. It starts right about here where the highways come together, and works its way up the mountain like this. It would be south of the new developments around Waikapu and the golf course, and so forth. And, it would divide off Maalaea into South Maui where most of think it belongs, and keep Waikapu up with Wailuku. That's easy to do; we just say that part of the 6th precinct of the 8th district which is north of Pohakea Gulch is in this residency area, and that part which is south of it is this district. With that one, I think it's kind of clear and straight forward.

The third item that I want to bring to your attention is one that I was on the prevailing side, and that was dealing with this East Maui residential area. Remember, one of the criterias we had for drawing a line here was to make sure that we had all this real rural area not mixed up with the areas in here, which aren't so rural; we kept the identity of that area fairly consistent. We were concerned -- I think all of us were concerned that it's a small population, but I guess we figured that well, even so, they can mount some credible candidates from that small population and we'd try to live with it. I've been thinking about that since, and I'm not happy with it anymore. It seems to me that it's even...we know it's smaller than Lanai, and what has our experience been

Sparks: (Continued) with Lanai...which is also a remote region of the county with a small population. The practical political experience has been that for something like thirty-six years, that has been a very safe seat for one person. The other way of saying that is it has been an uncontested seat, and as a result of that, the general population has not had a choice in that seat. There's been many times when nobody chose to run against Goro; there's been several other times when somebody did, but they weren't able to mount any kind of a credible candidacy or campaign in this area and so they got swamped. What I'm saying is that that in effect removes from the voters of the county a choice on that seat. To have a choice, the voters have to have credible candidates to choose between. If that's been the experience for thirty-some years on Lanai, do you really want to do that for another seat? And take two seats out of an electoral contest, basically, and hand them over to somebody who's not going to be facing any credible competition?

Mancini: The cause and effect is the fact as you have such few voters, the candidate can garner the number of voters?

Sparks: There's two causes; one is the small number of voters in that area, and the other is the remoteness of the area because...

Mancini: What has remoteness got to do with it?

Sparks: Because if you were here or Lanai...it's pretty much the same...and you wanted to compete against somebody who was an incumbent and who had been working over here with the people over here, and had got his name in the papers alot, and had all the name familiarity going for him...you have a lot to go against. You need to have financing, you need to have a lot of people helping you to make a credible candidacy -- and, you need to be able to get from your home over there, where the voters are, to campaign effectively. Now it's much more problem probably for Lanai than it is here; you can get in the car and drive, but it's still an onerous task to campaign effectively. You can't do it by having your neighbors happy with you...because Lanai has shown that; you have to campaign effectively over here.

Woodburn: That remoteness is going to impact any representative from that area, right?

Sparks: Less so if they reside here; it's a lot closer and there's a lot more people there, because it makes the pool larger. I think it's those two factors -- small pool to begin with, and the very difficult challenge to campaign effectively a long ways from your home -- in effect have meant, as they have clearly meant for Lanai, virtually no electoral contests.

Cockett: This new area that you're proposing would go into the Hana district -- what does that encompass?

Sparks: That would encompass this precincts 1201 and 1202.

Cockett: What township would that be?

Sparks: Haiku, Ulumalu, Pauwela and all that in between here; that's almost 5,000 people. And, the problem there of course is, as Jamie pointed out before, the nature of this residential area is quite different than most of these areas, and that's why we didn't want to include them before. But, as I said, I've rethought it and changed my mind. I don't think any of us want to, in effect, remove two seats from real choices for the voters; that really dilutes accountability from the council to the voters.

Woodburn: So the downside, the area that it's currently...

Sparks: Yes, this one then would be smaller.

Woodburn: What would the population of that be?

Sparks: Population numbers...I'm just running on memory...is you're talking 5,000 less, but since we're talking about the pool of candidates, I'd stay with registered voters...which I have more precise numbers for anyway. This one...if we add this to here, it would then become...instead of 880 voters...2800 voters; that's even a few more than Molokai. And, at the same time, a good share of the people would be less remote. You're more likely to get good candidates coming out... This one would be...Paia/Makawao... that would be over 3800 voters. So they both would be large enough then to at least greatly enhance the chances of serious electoral contests and therefore accountability to the voters... With our thirty year experience...

Wright: Now wait a second, Al; we're not going to have that thirty-six year domination anymore because we limited terms. So, I mean I agree with your argument, except that it's not going to be quite in the same contest.

Sparks: It's not going to be as bad; every ten years at least there will be some kind of contest there anyway... [LAUGHTER] But in between times, I think there's a lot of experience indicating we probably won't have electoral contests, and therefore, not much accountability.

Fabrao: I do not agree that just because a place is small you cannot get candidates. So if you include Haiku...if the people in Hana run, they will be dominated by the other area because they have so much more people.

Sparks: There's more population there, but if you're right...that there's a bunch of people itching to be good candidates from there, they still have a chance. I mean, they can campaign for all these voters, but my guess, at least a good share of the time, it's going to look like an overwhelming task to challenge an incumbent...but, they could still do it. See, they have to compete anyway for all the voters...and it's all the voters I'm worried about here; do all the voters get a real choice at election time, and I'm afraid they won't with such a small pool of candidates. I'm sorry I didn't think that all the way through earlier, but it does come right down to accountability -- a structuring system that would be more accountable to the general public.

Mancini: Doesn't the logic fall apart when you think of Molokai? Molokai, to a degree the remoteness is the same as Lanai...they have more voters, but it shouldn't have that much of a significance if your logic is correct. Molokai has had changes and you always have candidates coming up and vying for seats...on both sides, democratic and republican.

Sparks: Molokai has about the same number of registered voters...it's a little less than those two areas...I think that's the key. But, there's two keys -- remoteness and the size of the pool of candidates and amount of registered voters. And, of course, Molokai's not owned by one owner, either, so maybe that has something to do with it.

Mancini: You had a dominate employer; now you've got two with the resort, but you've always traditionally had one, up until about ten years ago.

Sparks: And part of the answer is that Molokai's not as big or as close in as I'd like it either; I think those factors work to make the Molokai races not as competitive

CHARTER COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 10, 1992 - MAYOR'S LOUNGE

Page 9

Sparks: (Continued) as... The problem with Lanai and Molokai is they've had it for a long time, and they are separate islands with water in between, so...

Mancini: But I'm trying to think logically through it. You're not, obviously, suggesting that Lanai loses its seat. Obviously what you're suggesting is that East Maui maybe be extended to avoid some problems that you perceive to be in Molokai, but maybe don't... perceive to be in Lanai but don't in Molokai...

Sparks: I didn't say I don't perceive them in Molokai; they are not as serious, but they are there...the same factors are working. I'm trying to remember when we had really good election contests for the Molokai seat. Linda started by people recognizing that she lived there and she just came over here and made a really good campaign on Maui, and that's how she got into the council; but how often does that happen?

Mancini: Isn't one of the more limiting factors to good contests is the cost associated with having...it seems to me that's the biggest chill with regard to getting more candidates, no matter where you are.

Sparks: That's clearly true, and that's more for Lanai and Molokai than it would be here; here it would just be the cost on your car and your time...

Mancini: But the Maui members...most of them...the Maui candidates go to Lanai and Molokai.

Sparks: How often?

Fabrao: At least once or twice during the election year.

Sparks: That's because there's not too many voters over there; but they spend a lot of time with the voters in the Central area, and any candidate from here is going to have to do the same.

Fabrao: Al, you did say earlier that Hana being remote...that the candidate from that area needs to live in that area in order to be sensitive to the culture and area; how can the people living in this other segment you're talking about be sensitive to what's happening here?

Sparks: Well, you're exactly right; that's why I was in favor of it before. This has the advantage of they have to live there and experience life there...by expanding it, we lose some of that. But I'm saying, of those two pluses, I would rather have the larger pool of candidates because I think...otherwise we lead into a situation where we really remove accountability to the voters by making it a safe seat. And, that's a bigger problem, I think, than the problem of residing there, I guess. And, even Hana itself could suffer if you have another seat that's a safe seat that doesn't really have to face any serious competition at election time, and so forth...like Lanai has suffered when there wasn't any real serious competition to Goro over the years.

Fabrao: But I think anymore, and I may be wrong in this, but I think anymore the people of Hana are becoming more assertive and participating in community things, but I think this would be their chance to really do something for themselves. I'm not against your idea of expanding it because of the reasons you did state, but I still think that it's different...

Sparks: That might be really good for Hana, but remember that this person represents

Sparks: (Continued) all of us.

Fabrao: Yes, I understand that.

Sparks: And we want a choice if we're going to have real accountability to the rest of the county. So, if we structure it effectively that there's not going to be much of a choice most of the time, now we're going to have maybe seven real races each election year instead of eight.

Fabrao: My other concern is that it has already been in our literature that that's... East Maui would be that portion. How can we get it out to the public for their input?

Wright: There's no way right now; we don't have enough time to do that.

Sparks: Well, we could make our choice and extend it later. But as I said, I don't think any of us want to lose the electoral process if it means holding elected officials accountable to the public. If we have another race that's most of the time not going to be a real competitive race, that's what we're doing, and that's a real problem. So anyway, Thursday I'm going to bring that up for a vote and I would hope...then I think we'd have a residency scheme that we can present to the voters. If we leave it this way, I'm not going to be the only one to notice what we've done, and they make some powerful arguments against our whole...

Mancini: What are you suggesting for East Maui now? That you combine it with something?

Sparks: You include everything on this side of the line...Haiku, Pauwela and...

Wright: What are the precinct numbers?

Sparks: Precincts 1201 and 1202 move from here to there.

Mancini: It goes out of Haiku and into East Maui?

Sparks: Yes. So this one's now Makawao-Paia.

Mancini: And the other one's at the gulch?

Sparks: Pohakea Gulch.

Mancini: How do you spell Pohakea?

Sparks: Pohakea.

Mancini: Everything which is east?

Sparks: North and south.

Mancini: North and south of the gulch.

Cockett: What is the name of the gulch again?

Wright: Pohakea.

Sparks: P..o..h..a..k..e..a..

Mancini: What precinct was that one in now?

Sparks: 806.

Mancini: All the property within 806, north and south of Pohakea Gulch, go to Wailuku?

Wright: No. North of it goes; south goes to South Kihei.

Sparks: That part of 806 north of the gulch goes into Wailuku.

Wright: South of it goes to South Maui.

Sparks: That part of the precinct south of Pohakea...

Cockett: Which would include Maalaea.

Sparks: Yes; and also while we're at it, I think we do need to pay a little attention to how we call these things...what name we give them. The power of naming things is an important power in future discourse. If we do this, I think South Maui would make sense here; Kahului would make sense for that one; this would probably be Wailuku-Waikapu-Waihee; this one would be Makawao-Paia; Upcountry is okay here...we did have it named Kula-Pukalani-Ulupalakua.

Woodburn: Under the Makawao one, you're just taking out the Haiku district then, and putting it in with East Maui?

Sparks: And everything east of Haiku.

Mancini: There are two changes you're looking to make.

Sparks: Three, actually.

Mancini: What's the third one? The first one is 1201 and 1202 out of Haiku into East Maui; and then you've got the gulch question; and...

Yonenaka: And then Wailuku.

Sparks: And you move 906 and 804 into Wailuku from Kahului.

Mancini: 906 and 804...

Sparks: That's the way you wrote it up on the yellow page before. 804 would go to Wailuku. 905 would go to Wailuku.

Reyes: Oh, 804 and 905.

Mancini: Okay, that's your third change; I'll try to draft that this afternoon.

Sparks: And then it'll be ready to slip right in there. You already drafted that last one we talked about, Paul, in the yellow pages before.

Okay, that's all I have to say today, and I would encourage you to think about those and maybe we can make those changes Thursday. Anything else?

CHARTER COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 10, 1992 - MAYOR'S LOUNGE

Page 12

Woodburn: Is this part of the agenda for Thursday?

Sparks: It's part of my agenda, yeah.

Woodburn: Plus Victor's issue on qualifications?

Sparks: Yeah; reconsideration again basically.

Woodburn: Do we vote again on acceptance of the document? Or are we complete on that?

Wright: It should be that the document's accepted, except for whatever's amended on Thursday. I think that's already been done.

Sparks: And then if we accept these, they'll go into the document then.

Mancini: I'm going to suggest that Marilyn comes on Thursday, just because you'll have her here...she has the system, so there's no use running around looking for her later.

Wright: That would be a great idea, Paul.

III. NEXT MEETING DATE
Thursday, August 13, 1992 at 4:00 p.m., Council Committee Room, 7th Floor.

IV. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, Meeting Chairman Sparks adjourned the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

ACCEPTED:

Robert Nakasone, Chairman Date