

Breakout Workgroup Reports

GROUP: Social and Cultural Issues **Date: 12/2/03**

This report summarizes the deliberations and recommendations from one of five workgroups. Each workgroup agreed on a facilitated process, heard from a panel members involved in conducting a study on the issue area or as a member of the Energy Policy Forum (Forum), and identified major issues and options/actions as well as 1-3 critical next steps to move forward the energy policy vision in the area.

The following report on **SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ISSUES**, provides in:

Section 1-- the priority critical actions which need to be taken in the next 1-3 years to forward the energy vision/goals; these were determined by analyzing the actions according to agreed-upon criteria of: (i) fits vision, (ii) financially viable, (iii) politically acceptable, (iv) community acceptability, (v) timeliness, and (vi) criticality.

Section 2-- an evaluation of the critical actions according to criteria agreed upon by the group, which were: (i) fits the vision, (ii) financially viable, (iii) politically acceptable, (iv) community acceptability, (v) timeliness, and (vi) criticality.

Section 3-- a list of all issues/options that were identified for consideration in developing the implementation plan, which includes short and long term actions.

Section 4 -- Summit participants who are interested in assisting the Forum in further work in this area.

Section 5-- Panelists and Facilitation Team members, and

Section 6-- Comments, which include notes from the facilitation team and/or panelists, questions of the panelists, or other issues/concerns brought up by participants.

Section 1. Critical Actions to be taken in the next 1-3 years

The group prioritized the options/actions for achieving the vision according to agreed-upon criteria; and determined that the following were the most critical to address in the next 1-3 years:

- A. Assess energy options for impact on low income & seniors.
- B. Engage Hawaiian practitioners, values, concepts, and critical island thinking at ALL levels of discussion. Focus groups within Hawaiian community.

Section 2. Analysis of Issues and Options Matrix

The two options in Section 1 were evaluated according to the six criteria agreed upon by the group as presented in the matrix that follows:

Factors Alternative Options and Actions

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1.	Fits Vision	+	++						
2.	Financially Viable	+	++						
3.	Politically Acceptable	++	++						
4.	Community Acceptability	++	++						
5.	Timelines	++	++						
6.	Criticality	++	++						

chart

Key:	++	highly positive effect	--	highly negative effect
	+	positive effect	-	negative effect
	0	no effect	?	need more information
			n/a	not applicable

Section 3. Issues and Options Identified by the Group

After presentations by the panel (members are listed in Section 5), time was allocated for further questions and clarification before the facilitator explained the focus of the deliberation and the outcomes. The group spent most of the time proposing and discussing the following options/actions to address the identified issues in energy conservation/efficiency:

- (i) Provide incentives to motivate recycling at point of landfill.
- (ii) Provide incentives to motivate conservation and efficiency and environmental protection.
- (iii) Develop matrix for siting projects, development, etc., in communities.
- (iv) Require community benefit agreement (to balance project impact) re: siting.
- (v) Outreach to impacted communities (i.e., neighbor islands) to get fuller range of knowledge and ideas.
- (vi) Energy projects should engage diverse elements of communities by fostering community education in “Learning Communities”.
- (vii) Energy from plants / crops for biodiesel.
- (viii) Use human capital (i.e., Job Corps, prison population, work release, etc.) to install, produce & maintain renewable energy components, products, etc.
- (ix) Involve visitor industry by restoring agriculture and educating tourism employees on energy impacts of tourism. Example: educating tour bus operators on impact of excessive engine idling while waiting for pickups.
- (x) Penalize inefficiency, pollution, non-conservation at production level.

Section 4. List of participants interested in followup work.

Participants were asked to provide their names and contact numbers if interested in continuing work with the Forum in this area. They are:

(i) Gay Chung – B(1)

Section 5. List of Panelists and Facilitation Team

(i) The following panelists presented information on the studies or work they had conducted in the area:

- Robbie Alm, Hawaiian Electric Co.
- Richard Paglinawan, Pa Ku‘i A Lua
- Ruby Hargrave, Honolulu Community Action Program
- Jeff Mikulina, Sierra Club

(ii) The Facilitation Team members were:

- Bruce Barnes, Lead Facilitator
- Sharon Rowe and Stanley Parnell, Co-facilitators & Recorders

Section 6, Comments

(i) Questions for the Panel:

- (a) **Can Hawaiians become self-sufficient?** Both/all sides need to work together to avoid “knee jerk” reactions to issues of development. Give active role to all sides.
- (b) **How is each island unique?** Both geographically and culturally (i.e., Molokai and the unique reaction of that island to the proposals to host cruise ships).
- (c) **How do self-sufficiency and sovereignty relate?** Sovereignty means self-sufficiency. Hawaiians in cultural practice have demonstrated self-sufficiency, but don’t discuss it in terms of these issues.
- (d) **Does rate equalization mean statewide distribution?** No. Equalization could mean imposed rates, perhaps we can create situations where geography doesn’t dominate rates.
- (e) **To what extent are electrical lines perceived to have health impacts?** Health risks of EMF comes up only in specific cases, not as general concern.
- (f) **Has there been public interest campaign geared to energy use?** No, question is how to focus the information so people have a reason to know it.

(ii) Facilitator Note: The group only had time to put options A and B on the matrix. The critical point of option B was that Hawaiian culture and Hawaiian Island thinking have many of the answers (i.e., Hokule’a and the land and water management systems represented in the traditional ahupua’a systems) such that Hawaiian input must be present at all levels of energy policy discussions. In this way Hawaiian thinking and expertise can be included in energy policy deliberations at the earliest stages.